

# THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR SEPTEMBER, 1824.

---

Art. I. *History of the Commonwealth of England, from the Commencement to the Restoration of Charles the Second.* By William Godwin. Vol. I. Containing the Civil War. 8vo. Price 14s. London. 1824.

WHATEVER difference of opinion may exist respecting the precise character of the struggle that marked the period which this volume professes to elucidate, there can be none concerning its importance. The war between Charles and his Parliament forms, as it were, a central point in English story, towards which we can distinctly trace the steady bearing down of previous events during several successive reigns, and from which has ultimately resulted the present condition of Great Britain. Waiving all discussion concerning the existence or extent of the right of insurrection, we may assume two positions as fully established: the first, that, in the words of Mr. Godwin, 'the opponents of Charles I. fought for liberty, and that they had no alternative;' the second, we give in the language of Bishop Warburton. Although we differ from that Prelate in his opinion, that 'when Cromwell subdued his country, the spirit of liberty was at its height,' he correctly describes the parliamentary leaders, when he adds, that the interests of the country were at that period conducted and supported 'by a set of the greatest geniuses for government that the world ever saw embarked together in one common cause.' There are individuals who will dispute both these points, just as there are men who will defend the Jesuits, and contend for the lawfulness and innocence of West India slavery. We feel quite as little inclination to argue with the one as with the other class of desperate wranglers.

The history of that period has not yet been adequately written, although materials of inestimable value are easily accessible.

VOL. XXII. N.S.

R

Sir James Mackintosh has *promised* to supply this important desideratum;—we shall see whether his purpose will ripen to performance. In the mean time, this spirited sketch will be highly acceptable, and we hold ourselves indebted to Mr. Godwin for his manly and, to a considerable extent, successful attempt to throw light upon this most interesting portion of the annals of our country.

The two most extensive and decided experiments in the science of government that occur in the history of modern times, have been made by the two most highly civilized of European nations, England and France. In the former instance, it was the result of circumstances, seized and directed by a combination of individuals whose superiors in knowledge, practical wisdom, and calm determination, the world has never yet seen. In the second, it was deliberately and avowedly made by men, of whom some were eminent for eloquence and genius, but not one, as far as we are able to ascertain,\* was possessed of that clear and vigorous judgement, those large, yet definite views, which are among the indispensable qualifications of the legislator and ruler. In point of moral dignity, there can be no comparison drawn between the respective parties. The most amiable and, politically speaking, the most virtuous of those who urged on the great revolutionary experiment among our neighbours, were, either openly or virtually, infidels; while the exalted piety of the leaders of the Commonwealth, has given a lustre to their characters, which will outlive the period when all human administrations shall have ceased.

‘The history of the Commonwealth of England,’ remarks Mr. Godwin, ‘constitutes a chapter in the records of mankind, totally unlike any thing that can elsewhere be found. How nations and races of men are to be so governed as may be most conducive to the improvement and happiness of all, is one of the most interesting questions that can be offered to our consideration. What are the advantages or disadvantages that result from placing the reins of power and the guidance of the state ostensibly in a single hand, in a race of kings, is a problem which every friend of man would wish to have thoroughly examined. In ancient history, we have various examples of republics established on the firmest foundation, and which seemed in several respects eminently to do credit to that form of government. In modern times, the republican administration of a state has been chiefly confined to governments with a small territory; the Commonwealth of England is the memorable experiment in which that scheme of affairs has been tried upon a great nation.’

---

\* Perhaps Mirabeau was an exception; but his execrable morals neutralized the influence of his matchless powers.



‘It is of the republicans or commonwealths-men that it is the purpose of this work especially to treat. They were a set of men new in this country; and they may be considered as having become extinct at the Revolution in 1688. It will not be the object of these pages to treat them, as has so often been done, with indiscriminate contumely. They were, many of them, men of liberal minds, and bountifully endowed with the treasures of intellect. That their enterprise terminated in miscarriage is certain; and a falling party is seldom spoken of with sobriety or moderation by the party that is victorious. Their enterprise might be injudicious: the English intellect and moral feeling were probably not sufficiently ripe for a republican government; it may be that a republican government would at no time be a desirable acquisition for the people of this country. But the men may be worthy of our admiration, whose cause has not prospered; and the tragic termination of a tale will often not on that account render the tale less instructive, or less interesting to a sound and judicious observer.’.....

‘The republican party in England dates its origin from the early campaigns of the civil war, and did not become wholly extinct till the Revolution in 1688. But, as a party having an important influence in political affairs, their extinction may be referred to the period of the Restoration. Their indications of life afterwards were futile and fitful, like the final flashes and struggles of an expiring flame.’

All troublous times have a manifest tendency to the production of *character*; but it was the distinction of England's Civil War, that it called forth lofty character. Admiration, intense admiration of the men and their exalted qualities, by no means includes approbation of all their actions. But even where we feel least inclined to go along with them in their acts or arguments, we have no hesitation in admitting their conscientious conviction that the principles by which they were guided, were just and right. Of Cromwell we are not now speaking. In the moral composition of that eminent leader, there were anomalies difficult of solution; but, while we condemn his usurpation, and the means by which he manœuvred his way to power, no impartial person can be insensible to the splendid qualities which distinguished him; to his true English feeling, his public spirit, and his large and liberal views of civil and ecclesiastical policy. Nor was it in the heat and storm of those tempestuous times only, that the illustrious men of that age were called forward. The period immediately preceding was remarkably fertile in political genius. Coke and Selden are names, inferior in true lustre to none recorded in the annals of their country. Of the former, it is well observed by Mr. Godwin, that ‘the peculiarities of his mind seem never to have been justly appreciated.’

‘Sir Edward Coke seems to be universally admitted to be the

great oracle of the laws of England. He rose through the various stations of Speaker of the House of Commons, Solicitor-general, Attorney-general, Chief-justice of the Common Pleas, and Chief-justice of the King's Bench, by merit only, without employing, in the progress of his elevation, as he himself expressed it, "either prayers or pence." It was his saying, when the duties of that high office were not so well ascertained as they have since been, that "a judge should neither take nor give a bribe." Sir Edward Coke had the honour to be the first great lawyer, who set himself in opposition to the enormous prerogatives then claimed by the Crown. Having, in 1615 and 1616, thwarted King James in his unlimited pretensions three several times, he was, in the latter of these years, removed from the place of Chief-justice of the King's Bench, Lord Chancellor Ellesmere affirming to him on the occasion, that he was too popular for a judge. In the parliament of 1621, he took a spirited part in the debates against arbitrary imprisonment; and when that assembly was dissolved, he was committed to the Tower, his papers and securities seized, and a suit was commenced against him by the Crown for a pretended debt of thirty thousand pounds. But the last great act of Sir Edward Coke's life was the framing the Petition of Right, which was endued with the form of a law in the parliament of 1628. The purpose of this measure was, to forbid the imposing any gift, loan, benevolence, or tax to the king, without the authority of parliament, to declare that no subject shall be detained in prison without having the power to claim his deliverance by due course of law, to abolish the arbitrary billeting of soldiers, and to condemn the proceeding against any of the subjects of the realm by martial law during a time of peace. Sir Edward Coke was fourscore years of age at the time of passing this law, and he lived six years longer. It is impossible to review these proceedings, without feeling that the liberties of Englishmen are perhaps to no man so deeply indebted as to Sir Edward Coke.

Of all the actual originators of the grand contest for civil and religious freedom, Hampden stood the highest. Gentle, yet intrepid, just and disinterested beyond the possibility of bias or allurements, popular, but firm, cool, discerning, prompt, and decided, he commanded the suffrages of all. His acute faculties, his consummate judgement, and his determined enterprise, secured to him the implicit confidence and support of those with whom he acted, and extorted the reluctant homage to his talents and integrity of those whom he opposed. David Hume—it was fitting that such a man should sneer at John Hampden—when adverting to the attempted emigration of this illustrious man, in company with Pym, Cromwell, Hazelrig, and other patriots, permitted himself to say, that he 'resolved to fly to the other extremity of the globe, where he and his friends might enjoy lectures and discourses of any length or form which pleased them.' And such miserable trash as this



passes current as legitimate history—the popular and accredited history of England! No. Hampden and his companions sought to flee from civil and religious tyranny, dark, subtle, and intolerant. They would fain have reached an asylum from grievances and vexations, galling to minds like theirs. They served God, and this of itself entitled them to the antipathy of the unbeliever. They held it in abhorrence that despotism should lord it over the minds and consciences of men; and this has drawn down upon them the empty sarcasm of the servile apologist for tyranny. Hume elsewhere remarks, that ‘the prevalence of the Presbyterian sect in the parliament, discovered itself from the beginning, by insensible, but decisive symptoms. Marshall and Burgess, two puritanical clergymen, were chosen to preach before them, and entertained them with discourses seven hours in length.’ Mr. Godwin’s reply to this false statement is direct and unanswerable.

‘The most considerable of the parliament sermons were printed, and I believe there is scarcely one of them that would occupy more than one hour in the delivery.’

Hampden was looked up to by all, as the great pilot whose counsels were to ensure safety in the difficult course which the party who stood for the Commonwealth, had determined on pursuing. He it was who, in the general opinion, could draw the just line between the destructive extremes of popular license and despotic rule; and it was a fine illustration of his character, that when a negotiation was in progress between the King and the leaders of the Long Parliament, for placing the administration in the hands of the latter, the office chosen by Hampden, was that of tutor to the prince of Wales. He sacrificed the pride of high place and power, to the nobler but less signalizing task of forming the mind of the future possessor of empire, for its adequate exercise. The early loss of Hampden and Pym was irreparable. The latter was worthy to range with the former in the front rank of the assertors of liberty; and the death of both in 1643, was one of the greatest disasters that could befall the Commonwealth. They were succeeded by Vane, St. John, and Cromwell, as the efficient leaders of the patriotic party.

On the King’s side, the only distinguished statesman was Lord Strafford, and he was a deserter from the popular cause. To say nothing of the baseness of the act by which his royal master gave him up to death, it was grossly impolitic. Charles lost his only effective counsellor when he abandoned Strafford. But this was one of the many instances of fatal inconsistency, which led him at all times to concede when firmness was re-



quisite, and to be obstinate when a judicious flexibility would have rescued him from embarrassment. Mr. Godwin defends the proceedings of the Parliament in the prosecution and condemnation of Strafford; but his pleading rests on principles which appear to us fraught with the most pernicious consequences. He grounds his apology on the necessity of the case, on the safety of the realm, and on the dangerous position, that 'law is made for man, and not man for the law.' He suggests that

'Hampden, Pym, and the great men who then consulted together for the public welfare, understood the character of the king, and of all the parties concerned with him, better than we can pretend to do. They foresaw the probability of a civil war. They foresaw, which was more than this, the various schemes that would be formed for dispersing the parliament by force of arms, and they knew that Strafford would prove the most inventive and audacious undertaker for this nefarious purpose. Whatever engagements Charles had entered into, "of removing Strafford from his presence and councils for ever," he would have considered these as annulled the moment the sword was drawn.....There was undoubtedly no man in the service of the king, who for talents or energy could enter into the slightest competition with Strafford. Hampden and Pym, and their allies, judged they did wisely, and acted like true patriots, by removing this obstacle before the contention began.'

In other words, they acted on that most mischievous of principles, political expediency. On that ground, and on no other, they are defensible. That they were conscientious in their conduct, we firmly believe, as well as that they had the strongest possible plea, short of positive enactment. But, on this point, we are quite in agreement with Mr. Fox, in the introduction to his admirable historical fragment, that, although Strafford 'was doubtless a great delinquent, and well deserved 'the severest punishment, nothing short of a clearly proved 'case of self-defence can justify, or even excuse, a departure 'from the sacred rules of criminal justice. For it can rarely 'indeed happen, that the mischief to be apprehended from suffering any criminal, however guilty, to escape, can be equal 'to that resulting from the violation of those rules to which 'the innocent owe the security of all that is dear to them.'.... 'When a man is once in a situation to be tried, and his person 'is in the power of his accusers and his judges, he can no 'longer be formidable in that degree which alone can justify '(if any thing can) the violation of the substantial rules of 'criminal proceedings.' Mr. Godwin's answer to this clear and cogent statement, amounts to little more than that Hampden and his associates 'judged otherwise.'

The subsequent condemnation of Archbishop Laud, which was sustained on the same principles as those that gave plausibility to the attainder of Strafford, is considered by Mr. Godwin as a far less justifiable act. The prelate, he thinks, was sufficiently punished by his fall from power, and his consequent sufferings: it would have been enough to have dismissed him to 'obscurity and contempt.' Mr. G. attributes his destruction 'to the Scots, to the Presbyterians, and to the resentment of an individual who had formerly been the subject of his barbarity, the celebrated Prynne.'

We naturally turned with some curiosity to those sections of the present volume, which contain the Author's opinions on the religious questions that divided and agitated the Long Parliament and the Assembly of Divines. As the larger portion of our readers will probably sympathize with us in this particular, we shall extract rather extensively. After affirming 'the innocence of error in that sense, that the dissemination of opinions and arguments, where all are free to maintain, to examine, and to refute, can scarcely be injurious to the community,' Mr. G. thus proceeds.

'Among the great geniuses and profound politicians of this memorable period, there were a few who could look with a steady eye into the future, could measure the limbs and muscles of the human mind, and could see what man in a state of liberty could do and sustain, and what were likely to be the results of all he could suffer, and all he could effect. They viewed controversy and intellectual contention as the road to substantial peace and genuine vigour. They saw that liberty of disquisition was the wholesome element in which intellect refines; that, to weigh and discern truth from falsehood, the scales which are employed in the trial must be freely poised, and that there can be no real conscience, and no pure religion, where religion and conscience are not permitted to act without restraint.

'But what is scarcely less worthy of notice, there was at this time, a sect of Christians, penetrated with the fervours of the most earnest zeal, the Independents, who maintained nearly the same tenets on this subject with the party last mentioned. They were led to the conclusions they adopted, by somewhat of a different process. Like the Presbyterians, they cordially disapproved of the pomp and hierarchy of the church of England. But they went further. They equally disapproved of the synods, provincial and general, the classes and incorporations of presbytery, a system scarcely less complicated, though infinitely less dazzling, than that of diocesan episcopacy. They held, that a church was a body of Christians assembled in one place appropriated for their worship, and that every such body was complete in itself, that they had a right to draw up the rules by which they thought proper to be regulated, and that no man not a member of their assembly, and no body of men, was entitled to interfere with



their proceedings. Demanding toleration on these grounds, they felt that they were equally bound to concede and assert it for others; and they preferred to see a number of churches with different sentiments and institutes within the same political community, to the idea of remedying the evil, and exterminating error, by means of exclusive regulation and the menaces and severities of punishment.'

In the Assembly of Divines, there was an overwhelming predominance of those who pressed the adoption of the presbyterian model; and they were most powerfully supported by the Scots, who demanded uniformity of church-discipline between the two nations, as the price of their co-operation against the King.

'One would think that nothing could be able to support itself against these two considerations, the majority of the clergy at home, and the imperious demand of the neighbour nation. But there were men who had the courage to look at all this, and yet determine to proceed. The chief of them were Vane, Cromwell, St. John, Selden, and Whitlocke. There were two questions involved in the contention, that they deemed worthy of their utmost efforts; freedom from ecclesiastical subjugation, and the freedom of the press.

'This topic will be best understood, if we call to mind the five different steps of gradual descent and diminished authority of church-government, as it has been practised in different ages and countries professing Christianity. The highest and most perfect is that of the Roman Catholic religion, as it was at the time that its power was most uncontrollable. This is a system of unmingled and absolute despotism, teaching men what they shall speak and think upon subjects of religion, allowing no variation or diverging from the established standard, shutting up from the laity the books in which the origin and laws of Christianity are recorded, promulgating an *index expurgatorius* of all other books, calling in the aid of the faggot, the stake, and the *auto da fe* to enforce its decrees, and binding the whole with the awful and tremendous sanction of auricular confession. Popery also had the additional resource of binding all Christendom together as one man; and it had the advantage over all other forms of Christianity, in the masterly and costly way in which it addressed itself to the eyes, the ears, and the nostrils of its disciples.

'The second form of church-government, partaking of many of the advantages of the Roman Catholic system, is that of diocesan episcopacy. It aims, though at a distance, and with a diminished flight, at the same splendour: it accumulates its emoluments and its honours in somewhat of a similar manner. It issues its canons and decrees; it fulminates its excommunications. Like the church of Rome, it is rigorous and untemperising. It denounces schism as perhaps the greatest of all offences. And it punishes all deviation from its rules, at least it did in the times of which we are treating, in somewhat of the same manner as the church of Rome, with this difference, that where the pope and the inquisition burnt its victims alive, the church of England confined itself to the lash, the slitting of noses, or the cutting off of ears.



Next comes the presbyterian system, not less exclusive and intolerant, and impressed with no less horror of the blasphemy and perniciousness of sects than the former. Its chief distinctions are, the comparative moderation of its emoluments, and the plainness of its garb. The clergy of the church of Scotland were habited with something of the same unambitious sadness, as we see in paintings of the fathers of the inquisition. But this is in some respects a disadvantage. He that lords it over me, and would persuade me that he is not of the same ignoble kind as myself, ought perhaps to be clad in robes, and covered with ermines and gold. It is some mitigation of my sufferings. I should be glad to be deluded and dazzled to the last. It seems natural that human beings should prefer, like the widow of Benares, to die amid the clangour of trumpets, and the soft breathing of recorders, to the perishing of the deformed and withering blow of undisguised cruelty.

The system of the Independents has been already described. Its generous spirit of toleration, and fearlessness of sects, come in beautiful contrast with the systems already described. It demands no other liberty for itself, than it is willing to yield to all others.

But even this system did not go far enough to satisfy the master-spirits of the age of the Commonwealth. They detected a latent error, and saw a seed of despotism and oppression, even in the simple creed of this sect. The doctrine on the subject which obtained their approbation, received its name from Thomas Erastus, a German physician of the sixteenth century, contemporary with Luther. The work in which he delivered his theory and reasonings on the subject, is entitled *De excommunicatione ecclesiastica*.

The Independents taught, that a church was a body of Christians assembled in one place appropriated for their worship, and that every such body was complete in itself; that they had a right to draw up the maxims by which they thought proper to be regulated, and that no man, not a member of their assembly, and no body of men, was entitled to interfere with their proceedings. But the Erastians proceeded on another principle. They held that religion is an affair between man and his Creator, in which no other man or society of men was intitled to interpose. "Who art thou that judgest another?" says St. Paul, "to his own master he standeth or falleth." Proceeding on this ground, they maintained, that every man calling himself a Christian, has a right to make resort to any Christian place of worship, and partake in all its ordinances. Simple as this idea is, it strikes at the root of all priestcraft, and usurpation of one man over the conscience of another. Excommunication, or "the power of the keys," as it has been called, is the great engine of ecclesiastical tyranny. Those who claim to exercise this power, are hereby enabled to obtrude themselves into the most sacred and private concerns of every one who holds Christian worship and the ordinances of Christianity to be part of his duty. They inquire into his life, and find perhaps that his conduct and actions do not square with their ideas of rectitude. They examine him as to his creed, and discover that it does not tally with their private in-

terpretation of Scripture. They undertake to reduce his confession to what they receive for truth, and to prescribe to him penances and mortification. They require of him spiritual obedience. If he fails in any of these things, they shut him out from the commemoration of the merits of Christ at first, or excommunicate him afterwards. They refuse him the consolations of the religion he embraces, and hold him up to his brother professors as no better than "a heathen man and a publican." They take from him, by their arbitrary and lawless decree, that character which makes him respectable among his fellows, and sustains him in self-reverence, which is the root of all virtue. It was "the power of the keys," carried to its utmost extent, that enabled the popes of former times to place whole realms under an interdict, and to dissolve the obligation of subjects to the government under which they lived.'

In this last paragraph, there is much fallacious comment. We are as decided enemies to what is commonly understood by 'the power of the keys,' as Mr. Godwin or the sturdiest Erastian can be; but, that the right of exclusion exists in every voluntary association, we shall most firmly insist. It is essentially, and as practised among Independents, nothing more and nothing less than the right of every copartnership to arrange the terms of its own harmonious combination, and to visit their infraction by an exclusion to which, as part of that arrangement, the delinquent himself has given his previous assent. The parties coalesce on the ground of an express recognition of Christian morals; and the violator of that article of their compact, severs himself from their communion by his own act and deed, put in force by the untainted part of the community. They unite on the foundation of Christian doctrine, and the same result takes place in the event of an aberration from soundness of faith. That there is another process running parallel with this, and involving the condition and character of the individual, as it regards his eternal interests, has nothing to do with what may be called the forensic character of the compact. It is part and parcel of religion, considered as 'an affair between man and his Creator,' and no human tribunal has authority to give sentence in this view of the question. That the act on earth of a divine or inspired arbiter would be ratified in heaven, is a fact which can have no bearing on the case, taken as a merely human transaction, though influenced by spiritual motives. The absence of a just discrimination between these things, or rather their designed and artful confusion, has given rise to the pestilential doctrine of 'the power of the keys.' It has suited the views of interested hierarchies, to claim the uncontrolled dispensation of ecclesiastical penalties, and to enforce them by pretending to the dominion of the unseen world; but their noisy fulmina-



tions and arbitrary inflictions have nothing in common with the voluntary code of congregational discipline. The 'simple idea' of Erastianism 'strikes at the root,' not only of 'all priest-craft,' but of all order, and is utterly at variance with every legitimate view and purpose of Christian communion. An Erastian loses sight of the peculiar character and privileges of the Christian, considered as a member of the brotherhood of faith, and entitled to the confidence, the counsel, the admonition, and the prayers of all and each of his brethren. On his loose hypothesis, what becomes of the intimacy of Christian fellowship, implied in the apostolic directions, "that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another; and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it?" As to the alarming insinuations about intrusion into 'sacred and private concerns,' and the application of an arbitrary rule of rectitude to 'conduct and actions,' they are already answered. Among Independents, there is no such recognised intrusion, and the laws of duty are plainly ascertained.

But after all, a very important question arises as to the fairness of this representation of Erastian principles. We cannot say that we have ever set ourselves the task of reading the treatise *De Excommunicatione*; and we are only able, at the present moment, to refer to those who were probably much better acquainted with the subject than ourselves. Dr. Hill, in his very able divinity lectures, states, that Erastus resolved 'all the powers exercised by church-governors into the will of the State. It was his opinion, that the office-bearers in the Christian Church, as such, are merely instructors, who fulfil their office by admonishing and endeavouring to persuade Christians, but who have no power, unless it is given them by the State, to inflict penalties of any kind. Every thing, therefore, which we are accustomed to call ecclesiastical censure, was considered by him as a civil punishment, which the State might employ the ministers of religion to inflict, but which, as to the occasion, the manner, and the effect of its being inflicted, was as completely under the direction of the civil power, as any branch of the civil code.' Nay, the authorities cited by Mr. Godwin himself, do not by any means support the favourable view which he takes of the Erastian principles.

'A party was formed by Selden and a few statesmen and temperate divines, who proposed to restore to the magistrate the coercive power which the church had assumed, and to reduce the pastoral functions to exhortation and prayer.'

Laing's *History of Scotland*, Vol. III. p. 289.



'Erastians: for the most part lawyers, that could not endure to hear of any thunderbolts of excommunication but what were heated in their own forge, in other words, that were not controlled by some known rule of law.'

Perinchief, p. 32.

We must confess ourselves quite unable to discern the boasted advantages of this system, this alliance between the Church and the State. On this hypothesis, the Inquisition Erastianized, when it disavowed all power to inflict ecclesiastical punishment, and gave over its victims to the secular arm. It seems to us hardly possible to devise a system that should more completely trammel the free exercise of religion, than this subjection of Christian discipline to the enactments of a secular tribunal, and this concession to the magistrate, of a 'coercive power' in reference to Christian communities. Any thing, indeed, is better than the despotism of the priesthood. It is so entirely at variance with the whole character of the pastoral office, that when it prevails, it assumes a spirit of malignant and unrelenting persecution, peculiarly its own. But, though something might be gained in this respect by the substitution of lay authority, in all other respects the effect would be most mischievous, and the complete secularization of things sacred would be the inevitable result. Such, in fact, has been the effect, where not counteracted by circumstances, of the masked Erastianism of the English Establishment.

The present volume brings down the narrative of events, to the feeble efforts of King Charles after the decisive battle of Naseby, and his 'melancholy and disconsolate winter' at Oxford in 1645-6. Mr. Godwin appears to have taken great and successful pains in the use of his authorities; his matter is well condensed and distributed; and he has in general exercised a sound discretion in his views and reasonings. But his chief excellence appears to us to lie in the discrimination and description of character; and the frequency with which these interesting details are introduced, seems to shew that they are with the Author, a favourite exercise of his powers. We have already given a specimen or two of this kind, but we shall make room for one of a more highly finished cast than those which we have before referred to.

'Fairfax was an admirable officer; but it will be decided by all posterity, as it was decided by their contemporaries, that it was impossible to name a man in the island, of so consummate a military genius, so thoroughly qualified to conduct the war with a victorious event, as Cromwell. He was also, whatever some historians have said on the subject, of scarcely less weight in the senate than in the field. Cromwell was, besides, an accomplished statesman. There was in this respect a striking contrast between him and Fairfax.

Fairfax, richly endowed with those qualities which make a successful commander, was in council as innocent and unsuspecting as a child. He had great coolness of temper, an eye to take in the whole disposition of a field, and to remark all the advantages which its positions afforded, and a temper happily poised between the yielding and severe, so as to command the most ready obedience, and to preserve a perfect discipline. Fairfax was formed for the executive branch of the art military in the largest sense of that term. But in all that related to government and a state, he seemed intuitively to feel the desire to be guided. He was not acquainted with the innermost folds of the human character, and was therefore perpetually liable to the chance of being led and misled. He was guided by Cromwell; he was guided by his wife; and if he had fallen into hands less qualified for the office, he would have been guided by them. But Cromwell saw into the hearts of men. He could adapt himself, in a degree at least exceeding every character of modern times, to the persons with whom he had dealings. He was most at home perhaps with the soldiers of his army; he could pray with them; he could jest with them; in every thing by which the heart of a man could in a manner be drawn out of his bosom to devote itself to the service of another, he was a consummate master. It was not because he was susceptible only of the rugged and the coarse, that he was so eminently a favourite with the private soldier. He was the friend of the mercurial and light-hearted Henry Marten. He gained, for a time, the entire ascendancy over the gentle, the courteous, the well-bred, and the manly Earl of Manchester. He was the sworn brother of Sir Henry Vane. He deceived Fairfax; he deceived Milton.\*

Did he deceive them?—Or did he only deceive himself? The Republicans were disappointed in Cromwell; the Presbyterian leaders were his bitterest enemies; but, that he was a hypocrite either in his early patriotism or in his religion, has never been substantiated. Into this subject, however, we shall not further enter at present, having recently devoted an article to the *Memoirs* of this illustrious individual\*, and having the prospect of a more suitable occasion for resuming the inquiry.

We shall wait with some impatience for the remaining volumes.

---

\* *Eclectic Review*, N 8. Vol. XV. Art. *Cromwell's Memoirs*.

Art. II. *A Course of Lectures, containing a Description and Systematic Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity: accompanied with an Account both of the principal Authors, and of the Progress which has been made at different Periods in Theological Learning.* By Herbert Marsh, D.D. F.R.S. and F.A.S. Lord Bishop of Peterborough, and Margaret Professor of Divinity. Parts V., VI., and VII. 8vo. Cambridge, 1820, 2, 3.

NO great number of years has elapsed since the utmost alarm was excited throughout the country, in reference to the prevalence of irreligion, and the diffusion of infidel sentiments by means of cheap publications, adapted to the capacities of the lower classes of society. Speeches were delivered, and addresses were got up, full of vehement declamations against the agents of infidelity and blasphemy; and the agitations and outcries of the period were such as might have induced the apprehension that the subversion of Christianity could be at no great distance. It might now be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable to institute an inquiry into the methods employed in those times, to counteract the spreading mischief, for the purpose of estimating the amount of the services rendered to the cause of Revelation by those who represented it as being in peril, and whose stations and connexions would have imparted to their efforts an extensively beneficial influence. The "Apology for the Bible" of Watson, and the "Evidences of Christianity" of Paley, not to advert to other contemporaneous publications, are highly honourable memorials of the zeal of those writers, and of their solicitude to preserve their fellow Christians from the contagion of infidelity. What parallel examples of authorship have the later times to produce? What defences of the Bible, what refutation of calumnies against the Scriptures, what expositions of its principles, what exhibitions of its facts, what representations of its utility, have come from the pens of mitred or unmitred Dignitaries, as demonstrations of their Christian zeal? "A child may write them."

At Cambridge, however, the Bishop of Peterborough was rendering a service to the cause of truth, by the delivery of the Lectures which are comprised in the first two of the parts before us. These Lectures are on the authenticity and credibility of the New Testament; 'and it is hardly possible,' the Author remarks, 'that these important questions should be examined at a period more seasonable than the present, when every effort has been made to shake the fabric of Christianity to its very basis.' In respect to the persons who composed the Professor's auditory, a concise, perspicuous statement of



the grounds on which the New Testament is received as of Divine authority, could not but be considered as desirable, and could not fail of being useful. Such a service the Professor was well qualified to perform. His extensive learning, his critical acumen, his practised skill in comparing testimonies and estimating authorities, the clearness and strength with which his judgement can conduct an argumentative process, and the luminous order in which he is able to arrange the several branches of a subject, qualify him for treating with great advantage the several topics which this portion of his lectures includes. In this department, we willingly acknowledge his merits, and receive with pleasure these products of his labour.

To expect novelty in the pages of a writer who brings under discussion subjects already examined by the keenest minds, and viewed in every form and relation in which the advocates and the opponents of Christianity have for successive centuries been accustomed to consider them, would be most unreasonable. Such a writer accomplishes his own purpose, and satisfies every fair demand, if the information which he communicates be full and appropriate, though it may be repeated for the fiftieth time, and if the reasoning by which he endeavours to establish the ultimate facts for which such information is collected, be clear, compact, and convincing. No reasoner can be more attentive to the framing of his propositions, or the nicety of his expressions, than is Bishop Marsh: his advances are never made to new positions, till the points necessary for their defence have been secured.

The *authenticity of the New Testament* is the first of the questions which the Margaret Professor examines. He commences his inquiries by defining the sense in which he employs the term 'Authentic,' in the use of which many preceding writers have been very inaccurate.

'Some writers use the term 'authentic' in so extensive a sense, as to make it include both the question of authorship, and the question of fidelity and truth. In this acceptance of the term, a book, though genuine if written by the person to whom it is ascribed, is not authentic, unless the accounts which it contains are worthy of credit. With this distinction between the terms 'authentic' and 'genuine,' great caution is necessary to prevent confusion in the conduct of the argument. For, with this distinction, the proof of genuineness is one thing, the proof of authenticity another. And though we may *often* argue from the former to the latter, we cannot *always* do it. There are many books, both ancient and modern, of which no doubt is entertained in regard to the question of authorship, but of which doubts may be entertained in regard to the question, whether the authors have related what is worthy of credit. But

it too frequently happens, that writers who thus distinguish authenticity from genuineness, overlook the distinction in their mode of reasoning: and the very circumstance, that other writers have used the terms as synonymous, has led them more easily to the conclusion, that when they have conducted the proof of genuineness, they have furnished also a proof of authenticity, even in *their* sense of the term. It is true, that when the question relates to the sacred writings, a proof of the former affords a sure foundation, on which we may establish the truth of the latter. But the inference is not immediate, unless we take for *granted*, what it is our previous duty to *prove*. Another inconvenience arising from such an application of the terms 'genuine' and 'authentic,' is, that, though they are thus *distinguished*, they do not each for itself denote a separate quality, but are so far alike, that the latter *includes* the former, while it includes also an additional quality.

'These inconveniences will be avoided, by using the term 'authentic' in the confined sense, in which many English and most foreign writers use it; and by expressing the quality, otherwise *included* in the term 'authentic,' by a term which applies to that quality only. In this manner, all ambiguity will be avoided, and the argument may be conducted with precision. Instead, therefore, of employing the terms 'genuineness' and 'authenticity,' I employ the terms 'authenticity' and 'credibility;' the former to denote, that a book was written by the author to whom it is ascribed, the latter to denote, that the contents of the book are justly entitled to our assent.' Lect. xxiii. pp. 3, 4.

Having in this manner settled the import of his terms, Bishop Marsh proceeds to examine the question of 'authenticity,' which, he reminds his readers, is purely historical, to be determined on the same principles, and in the same manner, as the claims of any other ancient writings. The historical evidence, consisting of the testimonies of ancient authors, he correctly disposes in point of order before the internal; because 'where external evidence is so decisive as in the present case, and where no preparation is *wanted* for its reception, we should place it in the foremost rank.' In the arrangement of testimonies, he has deviated from the general practice, adopting, not the descending, but the *ascending* series, and tracing the lines of evidence upwards from the Fathers of the fourth century to the apostolic age. The reasons which he assigns for this deviation, are very satisfactory, particularly the following.

'But there is another reason for not beginning with their works, (those of the Apostolic Fathers,) which is no less cogent than the preceding. When we appeal to one set of writings, for the purpose of establishing the authenticity of another, we should take especial care, that the writings to which we make our *first* appeal, should themselves be free from all suspicion. But the writings ascribed to



the Apostolic Fathers, and especially the Epistles, which bear the name of Ignatius, have descended to us in a very questionable shape. And though we should probably go too far, if we asserted, as some critics have done, that they are *entirely* spurious, this at least is certain, that if they came originally from the hands of those Fathers, their writings have been so interpolated with passages, which from the nature of the subjects could not have existed in the first century, as to cast a shade over that which may probably be genuine. At the same time it must be admitted, that if those writings have been only interpolated, the interpolations appear to have been made for a different purpose, than that of obtaining evidence for the authenticity of the New Testament. But still they are not *exempt* from it. And even if every doubt were removed, even if it were certain, that *all* the passages were genuine, which have been quoted from the Apostolic Fathers, as evidence for the New Testament, they would still fail of producing the effect intended. For most of them are really of that description, that the authors might have written them, though they had never seen the book, or books, to which they are supposed to allude. If then we make *their* writings the *foundation* of our proof, we expose ourselves to the charge of building on a foundation of sand. Of this weakness our adversaries have taken advantage; and nothing has so contributed to impair the proof, that the New Testament is authentic, as the importance which has been falsely attached to the works of the Apostolic Fathers.' pp. 17, 18.

In the twenty-fourth lecture, the historical evidence, for which the reader has been prepared by the remarks of the learned Professor in the preceding lecture, is given in detail, commencing with Jerome, and including Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Origen, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenæus. These authorities are selected because they form the links of a chain of evidence which connects, on the one hand, with the fifth century, when the existence of the books which are included in the New Testament is so unreservedly admitted as to require no inductions of proof; and, on the other, with 'an age so near to the apostolic age, that where the chain of evidence will cease, its place can be supplied by argument which will incontestably prove, that there was only one short period, in which a forgery was possible, and that, if during that period a forgery had been attempted, it could not have escaped detection.' These authorities are not merely cited, but their testimonies are compared with each other, and the specific value of each is distinctly shewn: the enumeration is in every part accompanied with very useful remarks. In the twenty-fifth lecture, are stated the results of the evidence adduced in the preceding one; and the position is argued at considerable length, that, if the historical books of the New Testament were universally received, they



must have been received as authentic in the very places where they were composed, and by the persons to whom they were first delivered. This argument is applied in several directions, for the purpose of making manifest the absurdity of the supposition, that the books of the New Testament could have been a forgery. The internal evidence is the subject of the succeeding lecture, the last of part V. Its nature and value are well explained, and instances of undesigned coincidences are given as confirmatory of the external evidences, and as proofs of authenticity. Paley's truly admirable book, the "*Horæ Paulinæ*," is distinctly pointed out to the attention of Bishop Marsh's readers; which we notice chiefly for the sake of remarking that, in these parts, no account is given of the 'principal Authors in Theological Learning;' an omission which we shall be glad to have supplied in the future parts. The *account* is included in the title of the Lectures, as an essential part of the Professor's plan, but has, we believe, appeared only in reference to the first branch of them, the *Criticism of the Bible*.

The sixth part of the "Course of Lectures," relates to the Credibility of the New Testament, which is considered in reference to the character and situation of the writers, and the contents of the writings themselves. But, as the conclusiveness of arguments derived from such sources, necessarily depends on the integrity of the works attributed to the writers of the New Testament, the Bishop discusses this point previously to undertaking to establish their credibility and the truth of their contents. He proceeds to shew, that the books which we now possess as the works of the Apostles and Evangelists, are the *same* books as those which were composed by Apostles and Evangelists. The notion of integrity, as related to credibility, does not imply a verbal perfection: it is sufficient for this purpose, if the facts originally recorded, and the doctrines originally delivered in the New Testament, are the same in the existing copies.

'That integrity which is necessary to establish Credibility, does not depend on a variation of words, if there is no variation in the sense. It will be sufficient, therefore, if we can prove, that the New Testament has descended to us, *upon the whole*, in the same state in which it was originally written; and that we may justly confide in every thing which relates to facts and to doctrines.'

In proceeding with his subject, Bishop Marsh argues, that a general corruption of the sacred text was impracticable, and justly concludes, that the mutual and general check against corruption, which was afforded by the joint operation of manuscripts, fathers, and versions, must have preserved to us the

New Testament in the same state, upon the whole, that it was left in by the writers themselves. The following remarks deserve the serious consideration of some late writers, who have discovered a strange tenacity of opinion in respect to 1 John V. 7.

‘ I am aware indeed, that this argument, and not only *this* argument, but *every* argument for the Integrity of the New Testament, which has been used in this Lecture, must fall at once to the ground, if it be true, that the passage in question proceeded from the pen of St. John. If that passage existed in Greek manuscripts anterior to those which have descended to the present age, and was expunged by adversaries of the doctrine which it contains, the extinction of the passage must have been *universal*. It must have affected the manuscripts in the hands of the orthodox, no less than the manuscripts belonging to the heretics. It must have equally affected the manuscripts of the ancient versions. It must have equally affected the quotations of the Greek Fathers, who quote the sixth and eighth verses in *succession*, without the words which begin with *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, and end with *ἐν τῇ γῇ*. Now if it was really possible, that such corruptions could, in spite of every impediment, be thus generally extended, what becomes of all the arguments which have been employed in this Lecture to prove the general Integrity of the New Testament? Those arguments are founded on the supposed impossibility of doing that, which *must* have been done, if the passage in question *originally* existed in Greek manuscripts.’ pp. 14—16.

The question of Credibility, interrupted by the necessary introduction of the proofs of integrity, and a series of valuable remarks on the celebrated passage in the first Epistle of John, is taken up in the twenty-eighth Lecture, where it is treated of by the Margaret Professor in his usual perspicuous and able manner. The writers of the New Testament, he shews, possessed every qualification that can be required of a writer to make his writings worthy of credit. They could have no motive to deception, and their sincerity is unimpeachable. They could not themselves be deceived in respect to facts which were cognizable by their senses, and their perfect sobriety of manner gives us assurance that no delusions were misleading them in regard to the subjects on which they wrote. The situation and circumstances of the New Testament writers, equally with their personal character, vouch for the credibility of their records, as they afforded every facility for the detection of falsehood, if their accounts had not been faithful. The cases of the two Evangelists, Mark and Luke, who were not Apostles, are argued separately and at length.

In the twenty-ninth Lecture, the credibility of the facts recorded in the New Testament, is considered; and the preten-



sions of each book are estimated singly, by a comparison of its parts with each other,—of one book as compared with another,—and of the whole number of books as compared with other works of acknowledged credit. Examined singly, the parts are in agreement; compared with each other, the books mutually support one another; and the facts which they detail, receive confirmation from independent writers of established credit. The conclusion of this Lecture is so excellent that we shall lay it before our readers.

‘ The review which has been taken of the facts recorded in the New Testament, shall be concluded with some remarks, from which it will appear, that the actions ascribed to our Saviour, are of that description, that they *could not* have been recorded, if they had not been true. Independently of the miracles performed by our Saviour, which shall be considered in the next Lecture, his general conduct, as described by the Evangelists, is that of a person surpassing both in wisdom and in goodness the most perfect character that was ever drawn by Roman or by Grecian eloquence. The character of our Saviour, as represented by the Evangelists, is not drawn in a *formal* manner, exhibiting at one view the various qualities of which that character is composed. The character of our Saviour must be learnt by comparing the facts recorded of him with the situations in which he was placed, and the circumstances under which he acted. This comparison exhibits unshaken fortitude in the severest trials, calmness undisturbed by provocation, kindness returned for injury, and dignity maintained inviolate through every action of his life. Nor is the wisdom and judgement displayed on every trying occasion less conspicuous in the character of our Saviour. At the same time we perceive the gradual unfolding of a scheme for the general welfare of mankind, a scheme uniform and consistent in all its parts, yet misunderstood *at first* by the Apostles themselves, as being opposed to the general prejudices of the Jews. Facts of *this* description could not have been *invented* by the Apostles. Plain and unlettered Jews, as the twelve Apostles were, though adequate to the office of recording what they had seen and heard, were incapable of fabricating a series of actions, which constitute the most exalted character that ever existed upon earth. If the learning and the ingenuity of Plato or Xenophon might have enabled them to draw a picture of Socrates more excellent than the original itself, it was not in the power of unlettered Jews to give ideal perfection to a character which was itself imperfect, and to sustain that ideal perfection, as in a dramatic representation, through a series of imaginary events. Indeed, it is highly probable, that the Apostles and the Evangelists were not *wholly aware* of that perfection which they themselves have described. For that perfection is not contained in any formal panegyric, expressive of the writer's opinion, and indicating that opinion to the reader. It is known only by comparison and by inference. We are reduced, therefore, to this dilemma. Either the actions which are ascribed to



our Saviour, are *truly* ascribed to him; or actions have been invented for a purpose, of which the inventors themselves were probably not aware, and applied to that purpose by means which the inventors did not possess. And when we further consider, that the plan developed by those facts was in direct opposition to the notion of the Jews respecting a temporal Messiah, we must believe in what was wholly impossible, if we believe that unlettered Jews could have *invented* them.' pp. 71—73.

The question of miracles is indisputably of primary importance in the consideration of the truth of Christianity. If miracles have never been performed, the faith of the followers of Jesus is only a delusion. If the performance of miracles be incapable of proof, then, all other evidence on which Christians repose their confidence, must be imperfect, and may be deceptive. It is to miracles that the Author of Christianity himself appealed as the proper proofs of a Divine mission. The examination of this question is, therefore, very properly made the subject of Bishop Marsh's concluding Lecture on the Credibility of the New Testament. The consideration of it is too momentous to be omitted; and the strict course of proceeding which he had marked out for himself, rendered the previous discussions necessary, that the series of deductions might be 'regular and continued.'

Bishop Marsh defines a miracle, 'something which cannot be performed without the special interference of God himself.' 'A miracle,' he subsequently remarks, 'neither is, nor *can* be the work of man, unassisted by the special interference of God. For when a miracle is performed, an effect is produced, which is *contrary* to the laws of nature.' The concluding terms of this passage would suggest, we think, a definition preferable for its simplicity and precision to the one which he has formally announced. A miracle is the production of an effect which is *contrary* to the laws of nature. Whatever definition, however, may be adopted, it is evident that the works which are ascribed by the writers of the Gospels to Jesus Christ, are works which they attribute to Divine power, and which stand out from all acts and effects within the compass of human ability. All persons, whether believers or unbelievers, must admit, that the acts which are declared to have been performed by Jesus Christ, are, in the Gospels, represented as the grounds on which he challenged the regard of mankind to his authority as a teacher immediately come from God. And there can be but one question in respect to them—Did they really take place? The miracles of the New Testament are transactions of a most striking and stupendous character: can we justify ourselves in believing them as facts which form a

part of our historical knowledge? To the objection of the French Encyclopedists, that the notion of a miracle involves an absurdity, as consisting of parts which are irreconcilable, Dr. Marsh judges it to be a correct and full reply,—that if the same power which made the laws of nature, is able to suspend them, it cannot be true, that the notion of a miracle destroys itself. Mr. Hume's argument, which denies the competency of testimony to establish miracles, is examined more at length.

‘ A more powerful and a more seducing argument is the argument from *experience*, as explained by Mr. Hume in his Essay on Miracles. He begins by asserting what is very true, that “ a miracle is a violation of the laws of nature.” He then proceeds in the following words. “ As a firm and unalterable *experience* has established these laws, the proof against a miracle from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from *experience* can possibly be imagined.” In the next page he proceeds in the following words. “ ’Tis a miracle, that a dead man should come to life, because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must therefore be an uniform *experience* against every miraculous event; otherwise the event would not merit the appellation. And as uniform *experience* amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full proof from the nature of the fact, against the existence of any miracle.” In the second part of the same Essay, he compares the value of human testimony when opposed to general experience in regard to miracles. And to render the parallel more obvious, he founds the value of human testimony on *experience* also. “ ’Tis *experience* only” (says Mr. Hume) “ which gives authority to human testimony: and ’tis the same *experience* which assures us of the laws of nature. When, therefore, these two kinds of *experience* are contrary, we have nothing to do, but to subtract the one from the other.” Since then *experience* is *against* a miracle, whereas *experience* does not always decide for the veracity of a witness, the *experience* which operates against a miracle can never, in the opinion of Mr. Hume, be overcome by any testimony in its favour.’ pp. 82, 3.

Bishop Marsh meets this objection, not by denying the parallel which Hume has drawn between the two kinds of *experience*, nor by resisting that part of this argument, which makes the value of *testimony* dependent on *experience*, but by resisting that part of the argument, which connects *experience* with *miracles*. ‘ If,’ the Bishop remarks, ‘ there is a flaw in *this* part of his reasoning, the whole of it falls to the ground.’

‘ It appears from his own words, which have been already quoted, that he argues on the supposition of “ a firm and unalterable *experience*” in regard to the laws of nature. He takes for granted, therefore, that those laws *are* unalterable, at the very time when the question is in agitation, whether they *were* altered in particular cases.



The argument therefore postulates what it professes to prove. When we argue for the possibility of a *miracle*, we argue for the possibility of a *deviation* from the laws of nature ; and we argue on the ground, that the same Almighty Being who made those laws, must have the power of altering or suspending them. If, therefore, *while* we are contending for an alteration or suspension of those laws, with respect to the miracles ascribed to our Saviour, we are told that those laws are unalterable, we are met by a mere *petitio principii*. In short, the argument from experience, as applied to miracles, includes more than the nature of the argument admits. Though an event may be contrary to common experience, we must not set out with the supposition, that the rule admits of no exception. We must not confound general with *universal* experience, and thus include *beforehand* the very things for which an exception is claimed.' pp. 85, 86.

Paley has replied to Hume's objection in the same manner. 'To state, concerning the fact in question, that no such thing was ever experienced, or that *universal* experience is against it, is,' he remarks, 'to assume the subject of the controversy.' In what circumstances the aberrations of the human mind originate, it is impossible always to discover ; but when prejudice has early and strongly obtained the power of directing its speculations, an argument or a hypothesis, which its author shall deem conclusive against the reception of a system that he dislikes, shall be as paradoxical, and demand for its acceptance as much credulity, as would satisfy any experimenter on the simplicity of mankind. Thus Hume, after denying the competency of testimony to establish a miracle, admits that a miracle may be proved by human testimony, and that miracles are possible ; but this admission he withholds when the miracle and the testimony are made the foundation of a system of Religion, which is in fact the only case that requires such vouchers, the only case that serious inquirers would consider as worthy of such extraordinary proofs. It is idle to talk of experience when the occurrences are remote, both in respect to time and place, from our own personal acquaintance. Experience excludes history. And if the testimonies on which we believe the miracles, and receive the facts of the New Testament, be discarded as insufficient to warrant our confidence—if such testimonies be not valid authorities for the belief of whatever is not impossible—then the credence of men must be identical with their own consciousness, and nothing can be an object of their knowledge that is not an object of perception to their senses. The world can have no other history than that which every individual obtains in the events of his own experience.

With the thirtieth Lecture, the Author concludes his proofs



of the Authenticity and Credibility of the New Testament; and in Part VII., which comprises four Lectures, he treats on the Authority of the Old Testament. His first object is to state the reasons for which an arrangement has been adopted, which inverts the order of time in respect to the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures. 'If,' he remarks, 'the authority of a later record can be established without a previous inquiry into the authority of a former record, and the authority of the later record will assist us in establishing the authority of the former record, the later record becomes of necessity the first object of inquiry.' To all the books of the Old Testament, the term '*authentic*,' as used by the Bishop of Peterborough, cannot be applied, since several of them are the composition of unknown writers. The books to which it is applicable, are first described, and the credibility of their contents is argued from their authenticity. But, as this mode of proof cannot be adopted in respect to those books the authors of which are unknown, the Lecturer proceeds to shew on what ground the credibility of the latter rests. In Lecture XXXII., the books of the Old Testament are considered collectively; the term '*authority*,' as including both authenticity and credibility, where both terms are applicable, and as denoting credibility or truth, where the former term cannot be used, is applied to the whole of them; and the testimony of our Lord to the books of the Old Testament, is asserted as the proper and sufficient evidence of this authority. 'It appears, then,' Bishop Marsh remarks after an induction of particulars, 'that *all* the Hebrew Scriptures, as they existed in the time of our Saviour, received the sanction of his authority. If then the Hebrew Scriptures, as they existed in the time of our Saviour, contained the same books which are *now* contained in our Hebrew Bibles, we have the sanction of our Saviour for *every* book of the Old Testament.' This identity, it is the object of the thirty-third Lecture to establish; and the proof of it is deduced from a comparison of the catalogue of the Hebrew Scriptures which Jerome has given in his "*Prologus Galeatus*," with the account contained in the treatise of Josephus against Apion. The last Lecture is devoted to the integrity of the Hebrew Bible, for the purpose of establishing the fact, that the books which it contains, have descended to the present age without material alteration. In this part of the work, the charge of wilful corruption of the Old Testament writings, so frequently alleged against the Jews, is shewn to be without foundation, and the origin of the charge is very distinctly stated.

With the exception of the first two parts, the publication

and, we suppose, the delivery of these Lectures have proceeded irregularly and at considerable intervals. Three years were originally assigned as a probable period for the completion of the course. Fifteen years have elapsed, and four, out of the seven branches of Theology into which the system is divided, remain to be discussed. We shall, probably, therefore, have to wait for some years to come, before the opportunity shall be afforded us of perusing in detail the opinions of Bishop Marsh on the Divine Origin of the Religions contained in the Bible,—on the Inspiration of the Scriptures,—on the Doctrines of the Bible,—and the branch relating to Ecclesiastical History. With his opinions in Divinity, however, he has already made us sufficiently acquainted, and we shall probably find ourselves less at liberty to applaud his labours as an Expositor of the Bible, than we now are to commend the critical ability displayed in his treatment of the preliminary subjects. As outlines of the studies which invite the attention, and will reward the diligence of every person desirous of making progress in Biblical learning, these Lectures are truly valuable. They would be still more so, were it not for the deficiency to which we have already referred. Neither the department of the Interpretation of the Bible, nor that which includes the Authenticity and Credibility of the Bible, is accompanied with an enumeration of Authors who have treated on those subjects. It was announced, in the preface to the first series of the published Lectures, to be an essential part of the Professor's plan, to give a description of the principal books in Theology; and his readers were prepared to expect, at the conclusion of each branch, an account of the principal authors who have illustrated the subjects which it includes. Why this pledge has not been redeemed, we are unable to state, the omission being neither noticed nor accounted for by his Lordship.

---

Art. III. *The Birds of Aristophanes*. Translated by the Rev. Henry Francis Cary, A.M. With Notes. 8vo. pp. xxxvi. 180. Price 9s. 6d. London. 1824.

**T**RANSLATIONS have been appropriately called 'the wrong side of the tapestry.' The expression is applicable in the highest degree to translations from the ancient languages, and most especially from the Greek. Language is the conventional instrument by which mankind express their desires, their affections, their dispositions; but these again are influenced by customs, laws, manners, religion, in a word, by all the circumstances which modify the character of nations.

Words that are symbolical of peculiar feelings, whether inspired by religious ceremonials or by political usages, must lose all their effect in the very act of transmission into another language which has not received the impress of the customs, the state of society or manners, and the habitudes of thinking, by which they were primarily produced. This is an impediment which no qualifications for his task will enable the translator to evade; since it arises out of the great changes which time has effected, by introducing new modes of feeling, with great and signal revolutions in religion and in morals. Even the scholar can go no further than the dim lights of lexicographers and commentators will conduct him. They enable him, indeed, to become acquainted with the dead text, the mere letter-press, in short, of an ancient language; but what more is this, than an inert and mute image of that language, compared with it as it once operated with living activity upon the great mass of feeling and intelligence among the people by whom it was spoken? And if all that, comparatively speaking, can be done by the learned in exploring the Greek language, is to grope an obscure and uncertain way by the help of the glossary or the lexicon, what chance has the English reader of tasting the great master-pieces of ancient composition, who can only find his way to them through the medium of a translation? The text, indeed, if skilfully rendered, may be conveyed to him in his proper tongue; but it must be taken into consideration, that the mere text (of a Greek play for instance) is not the composition itself, nor can it give him an idea of the effect produced by it. When the poet built his drama, he calculated upon the effect of the whole, resulting both from principal and accessory, design and execution, on the organs of his sensitive countrymen, to whose senses and fancies the intonation of a living sound vibrated with an intenseness which the mere printed Greek word can never excite, even in the most finished scholar, how highly soever indued with susceptibility and taste.

The difficulties also of translating a Greek author, and of all Greek authors Aristophanes, in a mode so intelligible to the English reader, as to convey a tolerably adequate impression of the original, are not a little augmented by the necessity which drives the translator to a sort of forced compromise between his readers and himself, whereby they agree to take as much as he can give them of some of those qualities in his original, by which, as the principal instruments, his piece obtained popularity and honour. But it is an unequal bargain; for we must necessarily be losers in regard to many happy strokes of by-play raillery, and many lyrical beauties, for want



of certain auxiliary details (music, for instance) which, on the first appearance of the play, contributed to its success as a whole. We must now take it by parts, distinct and insulated, and therefore not lending mutual corroboration and light to each other.

Another and a still greater difficulty will be furnished by the reader himself. He will, perhaps, take up Mr. Cary's version of "The Birds," without being prepared for it by any previous acquaintance with the character of the old comedy; he will, therefore, be shocked at finding a drama which, in every scene, violates all the settled conventions of the modern theatre, and overthrows the whole order of his dramatic ideas. We must therefore seriously admonish him, if he ventures on its perusal, to dismiss, as fast as he can, the whole congeries of his preconceived notions. Between the old Greek play and the modern comedy, English, French, or even Spanish, there is positively no affinity but of name. Two things more unlike in frame or in conception, cannot be mentioned. All modern ideas of the drama assume, that there must be a regular plot, gradually developed, with its succession of actions and counteractions; and, above all, they presuppose the constant, unintermitted play, the predominating agency of love, —not as a sensual passion, but as a consecrated sentiment of the heart. In Aristophanes, we have nothing of the kind. The less we say of his love, the better. He does not exhibit even that secondary species of the passion, which,

—' through certain strainers well refined,

' Is gentle love, and charms all human kind.'

On the contrary, the warmest of our appetites stands revealed in his pages, without the hypocrisy of a mask. His object was, to make sport for the audience; and, as we have remarked, provided he gained this effect, he cared nothing at all about regularity of plot. The purpose of the old Greek comedy was that of stringing together, in delightful and ever-varying succession, the most fantastic assemblages of persons, characters, and incidents, which imagination, in her wildest frolics, could conjure up for their entertainment. Not that Aristophanes did not pursue and keep in sight a sort of central object. His comedies, for this reason, will not be found wholly deficient in a certain consistency of design; but this is not carried to such a degree of strictness as to exclude a motley, riotous groupe of sudden and unexpected pleasantries, numberless brilliant and playful allusions, perpetual corruscations of raillery and wit. Gayety was the presiding purpose of his drama, and the poet of the old comedy might extract it wherever he could find it,—from things living or inanimate, from heaven or earth, from gods or men. No subject, how grave or decorous

soever,—religion, government, the pathetic themes and lofty poesy of the tragic writers, the dithyrambic poets, philosophy and philosophers,—none were considered as out of his jurisdiction, provided he could excite mirth by introducing them.

We have, unfortunately, very scanty information as to the origin of this most singular species of comedy. If the Doric Epicharmus was its inventor, it should seem to have begun, in like manner as tragedy, with mythological fables, and to have continued them, as appears from the titles of several plays now lost to us, which occur in the old Scholiast. But, as it was the special prerogative of the old comedy to laugh at every thing, the introduction of that which was in itself grave, in order to render it ludicrous by means of contrast and parody, became one of its necessary ingredients. Government, law, religion, thus became its familiar themes. The incidents of private life were never introduced, unless it was the means of hooking in a public character. At Athens, the whole government, legislative, judicial, executive, was in the hands of the people. The people, therefore, were personified in the chorus; an organ of public sentiment borrowed from the tragic writers, in order to increase the comic effect by the parody, or rather, to render more striking the contrast between comic gayety and tragic solemnity. Sometimes this important office was assigned to *Birds*, *Wasps*, and *Clouds*. It was upon this part of the play, that Aristophanes lavished all the charms of harmony and rhythm. Some of his choral odes are of so exquisite a structure, and exhibit such unbounded opulence of poetic diction, that they might be transferred without violence to the tragedies of Æschylus or Sophocles. Sometimes, the solemn hymns of their sacred festivals were actually chaunted in his comedy. In the *Thesmophoriazusæ*\*, the women sing the very hymn which was sung at the feast of Ceres. For these reasons, the choral parts of the ancient Greek comedy are polished to the highest degree of lyric beauty. "*The Birds*" is a play which overflows with choral versification; and it has been reserved for the present Translator, to do adequate justice to his Greek poet in these the highest departments of his art.

But the comic chorus had a peculiarity that distinguished it from the tragic; we mean the *parabasis*, which is literally a transition. It was something quite parenthetical and adventitious to the play, in which, strange as it may seem, the Poet himself assumes the part of a *gracioso*, and at certain pauses or intervals, (for the Greek comedy was not divided into acts,) himself addresses the audience, vaunts his own merits, abuses

---

\* The *Thesmophoriæ* were festivals dedicated to Ceres.



his rivals, and not unfrequently ventures, as a burgher of Athens, to throw out serious or ludicrous projects for amending the commonwealth. Nothing can well be imagined more completely at variance with all dramatic unity; but such is the unequalled power of the Poet, that the absurdity disappears, and even the *parabasis*, which has nothing at all to do with the play, is so delightfully contrived as to administer to its effect. Of this we have a striking instance in *The Clouds*, in one part of which the Poet enters into a long, somewhat too long, defence of his political character and his religious opinions. It should seem from a slight analysis of this celebrated *parabasis*, to have consisted of five distinct parts. In the *commatium*, the Poet seeks to conciliate the benevolence of his auditors by his established merits, his recorded triumphs, as well as by the design of the present piece; answers objections to his own conduct; reproaches and ridicules his competitors for the prize; and occasionally rebukes the *κρίται* (judges) for want of discernment in having wrongfully awarded it on former occasions. Then usually follows the Ode or Strophe, an invocation to the Gods. The next part seems to be generally a sort of censure upon defects and abuses in church and state. Then comes the Antistrophe, in which the invocation to the Gods is resumed and finished. After this, the *parabasis* again returns to political and religious animadversions. The introductory part, in which the Poet dwelt on what was personal to himself, might be as long or as short as he pleased, having no fixed proportions but those which the Poet's respect for his audience dictated to him. In the present age of dramatic entertainment, this must appear a strange species of interlude, but it was in the true spirit of the old fantastic comedy. It added another to the series of wild and grotesque fancies which succeed each other so rapidly in the comedies of Aristophanes, and contributed to the keeping alive of that joyous revelry of the imagination, which would probably have been dispersed by a fable more regularly constructed.

Still further to impress upon the English reader the almost inconceivable remoteness of the Aristophanic comedy from the whole frame and colour of his own dramatic notions, we must remind him of the magnificence which distinguished the theatrical spectacles of the Athenians;—that their dramas were got up with the most elaborate preparation; that they were represented at the season of their most respected festival; that the successful piece was the only one that was performed, and that only once; and that such was the cost which they incurred, that the representation of three tragedies of Sophocles, is said to have equalled the expenses of the Peloponnesian war.



In no respect, however, does the individuality of this kind of composition appear more strongly marked, than in the materials out of which it was formed. The modern comedy of our own, and indeed of almost every other nation, is drawn from that copious fund of humour which is supplied by the characters, the dispositions, the follies of certain classes and sub-divisions. Not unfrequently, one man represents a genus, or, in other words, personifies a class, to whom some laughable vice or failing is common; such, for instance, as avarice, when in that case the chief interest of the play consists in the perplexities and embarrassments of the poor miser. Besides these resources, the modern dramatist has ample materials in the universal but varied influences of vanity—a master-passion, which creates so much of the comedy of real life, presents itself in so many different attitudes, and measuring its demands upon the homage of others by that which it arrogates to itself, affords infinite entertainment by its wounded affectations and disappointed pretensions. Now there is nothing of all this in Aristophanes. He attempts none of those portraitures of life, which belong to what is called the comedy of manners. He disdains all that exact imitation, both in incident and character, which all modern comedy imperatively demands. He sets out with a wild, extravagant *humbug*, and peremptorily requires our credulity as the condition of our being amused. He transports us into a new world, peopled with airy nothings, a race of beings having nothing in common with humanity but discourse and reason. Sometimes he dethrones the Gods, and exalts the Clouds, or at another time Birds, to reign in their stead. *τὴν τε θεότητα.* It is one of the tricks of his ingenuity, to take a metaphor literally, and then to exhibit it as a drama. In the *Clouds*, he introduces on the stage a chorus of those fantastic beings, dressed as Clouds, talking as Clouds; in order to shadow forth those metaphysic subtleties which at that time gave so much employment to the laborious idleness of the sophists. But when once the imagination can be beguiled into an assent to what he requires us to believe, and which we have just hinted at as being the price of admission to the entertainment,—when we have consented to receive the impossible as probable, and the extravagant as natural, then we are allowed to enter his ideal world, and are delighted with its wonders; for then we find every thing falling into its proper place, following in its right order, clear, natural, consistent; we find nature out of the limits of nature,—probability beyond the region of possibility. At the waiving of his hand, his aerial, grotesque imaginations troop gayly around him, but with perfect regularity and propriety. Each acts with a con-

gruity befitting the part assigned to it, and all is mirth, wit, and merriment. Sallies the most felicitous, unexpected combinations, pun, quibble, personal strokes, harmonious verse, ludicrous adventure, and what to the Athenian palate was far from being an unacceptable part of the banquet, a plentiful allowance of ribaldry and nastiness,—these fill up the rest of the outline, and collectively present something like a sketch (we presume to give no more) of the old comedy of Athens. Sometimes, as in "The Peace," Aristophanes conceals beneath one of these glaring impossibilities, his own political sentiments,—in particular, his warm, patriotic detestation of the Peloponnesian war, into which Athens had been plunged by her demagogues. His "*Ecclesiazusæ*" is a burlesque upon the Utopian constitution-mongers of the day; and we shrewdly suspect, with the Scholiast, that "The Birds" had something similar in view. In the former piece, some Athenian women dress themselves in their husbands' habiliments, get admittance into the *ecclesia* or town-hall of Athens, and having thus ensured a majority of voices, propose and carry a decree, that the public affairs should thenceforth be administered by women. A new constitution follows, having for its base the community of all things. Here also the reader is now, as the auditor was formerly, required to swallow a pretty good dose of the improbable; but it is a price which is usuriously paid back to him by the enchanting powers of the Poet. The scenes in which the secret meetings of the ladies take place, the manner in which they demean themselves as men, and the delineations of the popular assemblies, are touched with the most consummate genius. One inconvenience sometimes resulted, as Schlegel remarks, from this unlimited dominion over every thing assumed by the comic poet. Having reversed the whole system of things, turned all established ideas topsy-turvy, and squandered the utmost wildness of invention from the very outset,—the sensation is apt to become exhausted by reason of its intensity, and the repetition of extravagance after extravagance, is likely to excite still further expectation, and then to disappoint it.

These are some of the peculiarities of that old comedy of Athens, (nor have we exhausted the catalogue,) of which we have no other specimens than in the eleven extant comedies of Aristophanes. Now it is almost too obvious to remark, that, in the same proportion as these peculiarities are new and strange to the English reader, they redouble the perplexity of the Translator. For he has undertaken the duty of a master of ceremonies, who is to introduce to the wild and singular personages of the old comedy, a new-comer, just arrived from a country whose



entire system of conventional life, manners, language, feelings, are diametrically different. He has to smooth the way for his entrance, and, what is still more difficult, he undertakes to amuse him when he gets there. With regard to "The Birds," Mr. Cary was beset with innumerable difficulties. It is that comedy of Aristophanes which abounds in the greatest variety of lyric harmony. The measures are as changeful as they are captivating, and the metrical transitions recur so frequently, that the whole compass of our own poetry is quite inadequate to supply a corresponding variety. Yet, Aristophanes can never be said to be translated, unless this delightful variety be in some sort imitated, and in such of our measures as most resemble his own, not indeed in external structure, but in the feelings they excite, and the associations they awaken. For it is this which is the principal charm to those who can read the original. How then is this difficulty to be conquered? The Aristophanic tetrameter, for instance, if represented by the English measure which most resembles it to the eye, will disappoint and disgust the ear. Such, too, is the diversity between the genius of the respective languages, that a measure which, in the one, would be 'grave and Doric,' and fitted for lofty and dignified subjects, would, in the other, adapt itself only to those which are light and mirthful. The great principle of association, which enters so largely into our other pleasures, enters also into this. A metre may intrinsically, that is, in form and structure, be dignified and solemn, yet, from being habitually desecrated to low and ludicrous images, and influencing the mind by those associations only, can never afterwards be prest into the service of any other theme, or excite the train of ideas that belong to it. It would be to no purpose, therefore, in translating a play of Aristophanes, to adopt English measures which, in their form only, resemble his. This part of his task, Mr. Cary has, in our judgement, performed with singular felicity. Many of the Aristophanic odes, in his translation, display a richness, an easy, undulating flow, and an airiness and lightness, which manifest the accomplished Translator of Dante to be quite equal to the translation of Aristophanes. We think that his translation, on the whole, is equal to the specimens published a few years ago by Mr. Mitchell, but it is undoubtedly superior in the choral parts. That gentleman, however happy in the dialogue of Aristophanes, is not quite so successful when he grapples with the choruses. It is invidious to instance failures; but, as a specimen of inefficiency, we may point out his version of that beautiful and melodious chorus in the *Knights*, who chaunt an elegant, but vigorous and animated invective upon the sovereign people of Athens, beginning thus :



‘ ὦ Δῆμος καλὸς γ’ ἔχων  
 Ἀρχὴν οἷοι πάντες αὐ-  
 -θρῶτοι διδασί σ’ ὡς-  
 -πὲρ αὐδρὰ τυραννὸς  
 Ἀλλ.’

κ.τ.λ.

How little of the music of this passage has been preserved in Mr. Mitchell's version, a short specimen will shew.

‘ Honour, power, and high estate,  
 Demus, mighty lord, hast thou!  
 To thy sceptre, small and great  
 In obeisance lowly bow!

‘ Yet you're easy to his hand,  
 Whoever cringes;  
 Every fool you gaze upon,  
 Every speech your ear hath won,  
 While your wits move off and on  
 Their hinges.’

In the dialogue, Mr. Cary has, we think most judiciously, imitated the verse of Massinger. We shall extract the passage of his preface in which he refers to the structure of Massinger's verse as his model, because it is a curious piece of metrical criticism.

‘ Of our own poets, Massinger will, perhaps, supply us with a model of a versification adapted to comedy; for at the same time that it is extremely agreeable to the ear, it is little fettered by the stricter rules that confine the tragic metre, and has an air of freedom that brings it near to the ease and sprightliness of ordinary conversation. A late editor has carried his admiration of this poet's excellence, in the structure of his verse, very far. ‘ Massinger's ear,’ says Mr. Gifford, ‘ was so exquisitely touched, that I could almost venture to affirm he never made use of his fingers for the construction of a single verse; and his bungling editors, therefore, who try his poetry by such coarse mechanism, will more frequently injure his sense, than improve his metre.’ The chief reason of Massinger's numbers being more suitable to the dialogue of comedy, is, that he frequently puts into a verse more syllables than it would bear if they were all distinctly and strongly pronounced, so that we slip lightly over some of them as we should do in common discourse, in order to bring the verse into its proper compass, which the graver and more elevated tone of tragedy would not admit of. One line will be sufficient to exemplify my meaning:

‘ That every soul's alike a musical instrument.’

*A Very Woman*, A. 4. S. 1.

Here we have two words, neither of which the right measure of the verse will suffer us to pronounce with the same distinctness of articu-

lation that we should use in reciting them as they occur in the following passage of Milton :

' Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,  
But musical as is Apollo's lute.'

*Comus.*

' ——— others, whence the sound  
Of instruments, that made melodious chime,  
Was heard of harp and organ.'

*Par. L. B. xi. 560.*

Sometimes, indeed, Massinger outrages this liberty ; as in a line in that very act, on which his editor makes the remark quoted above :

' As near my right hand, and will as soon out, though I keep not.'  
*The City Madam, A. 1. S. 2.*

where it will be difficult so to slur over the supernumerary syllables as to retain any image of a verse.' pp. xiii, xv.

In his struggle with another difficulty incident to his task, Mr. Cary has not been successful, and for this simple reason,—that it was impossible to succeed. We refer to the quibbles and puns in which Aristophanes so much delighted, and which were so highly to the taste of his Athenian audience. We regret that Mr. Cary should have made now and then the attempt to transfer them into English. Wit that consists in a play upon words, is irrevocably fixed in its own language, and no skill can remove it into another. Among the verbal *jeux d'esprit* of Aristophanes, none occurs more frequently, than plays upon the names of towns, and slyly giving, by means of a double acceptation, a fling at some notorious blockhead or scoundrel at Athens. Thus, in the third act of *The Birds*, there is a hit of this sort at Cleonymus, a noted informer, by means of the word ΚΑΡΔΙΑ, the name of a city in the Thracian Chersonese, and also signifying the heart. Having allegorized the informer as an overgrown tree, *διδόρ μείγα*, it grows, says the Chorus, at a considerable distance from Cardia, and thus he denotes the want of courage for which Cleonymus was remarkable. It is manifest, that such a pun, were it practicable, would be hardly deserving of translation. Mr. Cary very prudently passes it by. So, also, with regard to similar puns upon the words *Phanæ* and *Clypsedra*, which are the names of two towns ; the former word also denotes the practice of informing, and *Clypsedra* is the water-glass by which the orators regulated their speeches. When, therefore, in another place, we find Mr. Cary fairly engaged with a pun, and endeavouring by sheer force to haul it into English, we could not forbear admiring the ingenuity of the attempt, but at the same time, smiling at its inefficiency, which compels him to call in the aid of a note. This occurs in

the scene in which the Legislator, having obtained admission into the city of the Birds, begins reading a new code of laws for their rising commonwealth. Mr. Cary's effort to convey the quibble to the English reader, we must pronounce to be unsuccessful.

• *Legislator*, (reading.) "And that the Cuckoocloudlanders do use  
Like measures, weights, and acts in senate passed,  
As the Olophyxians."

• *Pisthetærus*.

*Haul will I*

And fix thee in the stocks anon, unless—'

We have enumerated the literary difficulties of translating Aristophanes, but we have not mentioned one which is more perplexing than any of these: we allude to his grossness, ribaldry, nastiness, and vulgarity, qualities observable in all his pieces, and scattered with no sparing hand. It is a doubtful excuse for him that is urged by his admirers, that he was compelled to stain his drama with so much pollution, in order to keep in good humour his masters,—the *Demus*, that growling and fretful many-headed monster, who had, not long before, actually hissed from the stage, Cratinus, one of their favourite comic writers, for stinting them of their full allowance of impurity. This is an awkward dilemma for the Translator. If the Poet was compelled to gratify the taste of an Athenian mob, his Translator has to accommodate himself to the readers of a polished age, to the literary part of the community, to the *deïotai*, men of delicacy and feeling, who would naturally be disgusted with the literal translation of passages overflowing with physical and moral indelicacy. Yet, it necessarily follows from the conformation and plan of the old comedy, that even these dirty images and allusions are as characteristic of the style and manner of Aristophanes, as similar ones are of Moliere and Regnard, and they cannot, therefore, be altogether omitted. In the opening scenes, for instance, such omissions would make considerable 'chasms; for upon these occasions, the comic poet was driven, in order to secure their good-will to his piece, to the necessity of catering for the popular taste by a certain portion of ribaldry, which was looked for, and in truth demanded. Out of this difficulty, there is only one mode of escape, and Mr. Cary has, we admit, very judiciously availed himself of it. What we mean is this. There is a palpable distinction between those licentious and vulgar passages which are component parts of the drama, and without which his plan and his characters would be imperfectly developed, and those which were only a sort of by-play, parenthetically thrown out for the upper galleries of



Athens, and having no necessary connexion with the piece. We know not whether Mr. Cary acted according to this distinction; but he has, by whatever means, extricated himself with great judgement from a most appalling difficulty, and with all the restraint and circumspection which the case required. If our rule is a sound one, a translator has not the option of leaving out a single prevalent characteristic of his author; but unfortunately, filth and obscenity are characteristics of Aristophanes, and strictly subservient to his drama. After all, those who are amused by the "*Malade Imaginaire*," the "*George Dandin*," and the "*Bourgeois Gentilhomme*," must not be too fastidious with the physical nastiness of Aristophanes.

We cannot, however, thus lightly dismiss so important a part of our subject. Aristophanes has recently found zealous admirers, and perhaps too warm apologists. Their labours, and those of the Schlegels in particular, have swept away much of the calumnious rubbish which had for ages been accumulated against him. Thus, among others, the imputation of having been suborned by Melitus to write *The Clouds*, in order to defame Socrates, and of having thereby contributed to his death, (an event which did not happen till twenty years after the play was written,) has been completely disproved. The elder Schlegel goes, indeed, so far as to suggest that the play was not an attack upon Socrates at all, but upon the whole tribe of sophists who were swarming over Athens, and indeed over all Greece,—and that Socrates was only a personification of all of them collectively. We might be disposed to admit this,—although the use of the name of Socrates, we must continue to think highly indefensible; but we must not, cannot concede, that any fair defence can be urged for the plain-spoken and downright ribaldry of the Comic Poet. When, therefore, the laudable prepossessions which, on this score, have been so long felt against him, are attempted to be removed,—when a writer who has long been classed among the ministers of a wanton and libertine gayety, is held up as entitled to rank with the teachers of moral wisdom, and is recommended to the lecture-room of our universities, and the higher forms of our schools,—our duty will not allow us to coincide with such extravagant apologists. We trust that we have said enough to shew that we are not insensible to the genius of Aristophanes. We have not ceased to feel the effects of that wonderful language which, with its variety of inflexion and its endlessness of combination, at once faithfully interprets the most abstruse operations of human intelligence, and gives expression to the warmest emotions of the heart. We give credit to Aristophanes also for something

more than the inexhaustible beauties of his diction. We warmly admire his just and manly severity against the Athenian vices,—his opposition to the ruinous and expensive war in which his country was engaged,—his fearless chastisement of the factious demagogues who ‘bawled for freedom in their senseless mood,’—his contempt, so constantly expressed, of the frivolous pursuits of the sophists; but, while we admire also his wit, his versatility, vigour, and playfulness of imagination, our objections to his obscenity, and our reluctance to his being brought into familiar contact with younger students, remain unimpaired. We trust, therefore, that he will still be banished from the seats of instruction, and not be added to the list of writers, already too numerous, who, besetting the youthful mind in the very vestibule of learning, threaten the extinction of that ingenuous shame which is its best security and most graceful ornament.

In thus dwelling upon the impurities of Aristophanes, justice requires that we should give their full weight to the extenuations suggested in his behalf, drawn from the state of society and manners in those days. Among the benignant influences of Christianity, its effect in elevating the standard of public morals ought not to be overlooked. The moral darkness of the pagan world will account for the defilements of their language, and the licentiousness of their fancy. The gentle domination over manners and opinions which has since been so rightfully conceded to the fairer half of our species, was then wholly unknown. The Athenian ladies lived in a state of perfect seclusion. They peeped only occasionally out of the precincts of domestic retirement, at a sacrifice, or sometimes mingled in a religious procession. From the valuable treatise of Xenophon upon domestic economy, we learn that their education was scarcely superior to that of their slaves. No women ever attended the comic theatre, except that highly accomplished but abandoned class of females whose presence would be no check upon licentiousness. The sex as it now exists, did not exist then. Minds cultured into equality, but shrinking from all competition with those who were destined to be their protectors,—moving round a humbler but not a lower circle of duties;—living in a little world of gentleness and of sentiment peculiarly their own, from which men are excluded by their more rugged and severer occupations;—submissive even when they influence, tender in their reproaches, and lighting up in domestic life the chaste and hallowed light of undissembled affection, or rather of an ardent passion subsiding into the stillness of a consecrated friendship,—woman so enthroned, so beloved, so deserving of



being beloved,—woman so constituted, could not so much as be pictured to the fancy of an Athenian.

Having said so much of Aristophanes, it is time to return to his Translator. Our opinion of the manner in which Mr. Cary has executed his task, has been in general terms pronounced already. To say that it is the best translation of *The Birds* that has yet appeared in our language, is saying nothing. The only version of that play with which we are acquainted, is in prose, published about fourteen years ago\*. With a prose translator, Mr. Cary would disdain a competition; for *The Birds* is, of all the plays of Aristophanes, that which is the most poetic in its conception, its form, and its character. It is throughout the very breath of poetry, the native offspring of the fancy in its highest elevations. Boivin le Cadet, the best scholar that France ever produced, translated "*The Birds*" into French; but, as the book is out of print, and not to be found in any of the Parisian collections, we have never inspected it. The elegant translation which is the subject of our article, may be pronounced to stand unrivalled. It is to the full as vigorous and spirited a copy (and this is no scanty praise) as any of Cumberland's, and, in the choral parts, it far transcends him.

Before, however, we proceed to justify our commendations by extracts, the reader ought to understand something of the plan and conformation of the singular comedy which Mr. C. has chosen for the arduous trial of his strength as a translator. This cannot be better done, than by copying from our Author's preface, the remarks of A. W. Schlegel upon *The "Birds"* of Aristophanes, taken from the celebrated dramatic lectures of that profound critic.

"*The Birds* transports us, by one of the boldest and richest inventions, into the kingdom of the fantastically wonderful, and delights us with a display of the gayest hilarity: it is a merry, rapid, and highly varied composition†. I cannot agree with the old critic in thinking that this work is chiefly characterised by its general and undisguised satire on the corruptions of the Athenian state, and of all human institutions. It seems rather to be marked by a display of the

---

\* "*Comedies of Aristophanes, viz. The Clouds, Plutus, the Frogs, the Birds. Translated into English.*" London. 1812.

† The translation of this sentence does not exactly accord with the German. Schlegel says, '*The Birds* is distinguished by the most brilliant invention, in that kind of fiction which belongs to the marvellous. It is a poetic drama, light, aerial, grotesque, winged, like the singular beings whom it portrays.'



most harmless pranks, in which gods as well as mortals participate, and the poet does not seem to have had any particular aim in view. Whatever in natural history, in mythology, in the doctrine of divination, in the fables of Æsop, or even in proverbial expressions, contained any thing remarkable with relation to birds, has been ingeniously drawn by the poet within his circle: he goes even back to cosmogony, and shows that at first the raven-winged night laid a wind-egg, over which the lovely Eros, with golden pinions (without doubt a bird), brooded, and thence occasioned the origin of all things. Two fugitives of the human race fall into the dominion of the birds, who resolve to revenge themselves on them for the numerous cruelties which they have suffered: the two men contrive to save themselves by convincing the birds of their pre-eminency over all other creatures, and they advise them to collect all their strength in one immense state: the wondrous city, Cloudcuckooburg, is then built above the earth; all sorts of unbidden guests, priests, poets, soothsayers, geometers, scribes, sycophants, wish to nestle in the new state, but are driven out; new gods are appointed, naturally enough, after the image of the birds, as those of men bore a resemblance to themselves; the old gods are shut out from Olympus, so that no odour of sacrifices can reach them: in their emergency, they send an embassy, consisting of the carnivorous Hercules, Neptune, who, according to the common expression, swears by Neptune, and a Thracian god, who is not very familiar with Greek, but speaks a sort of mixed jargon; but yet these gods are under the necessity of submitting to the proposed conditions, and the sovereignty of the world remains to the birds. However much all this resembles a mere farcical joke, it may be said, however, to have this philosophical signification, that it considers all things from above in a sort of bird's-eye view; whereas the most of our ideas are only true in a human point of view.

‘The old critics were of opinion that Cratinus was powerful in living satire and direct attack, but that he was deficient in a pleasant humour, in the talent of developing his subject in an advantageous manner, and filling up his pieces with the necessary details; that Eupolis was agreeable in his jocularities, and skilful in the use of ingenious allusions and contrivances, so that he never even needed the assistance of the parabasis to say whatever he chose, but that he was deficient in satirical force; that Aristophanes, by a happy middle course, united the advantages of both; and that in him we have satire and pleasantry combined in the most perfect and attractive manner. From these statements I conceive myself justified in assuming, that among the pieces of Aristophanes, the *Horsemen* (the *Knights*) is the most in the style of Cratinus, and the *Birds* the nearest to the style of Eupolis; and that he had their respective manners in view when he composed these pieces. For although he boasts of his independent originality, and of his never borrowing any thing from others, it was hardly possible, that among such distinguished associates, all mutual influence should be excluded. If the opinion to which I have alluded is well-founded, we have to lament the loss of the works of

Cratinus, perhaps, principally, for the light which they threw on the manners of the times, and the knowledge which they displayed of the Athenian constitution: and the loss of the works of Eupolis, chiefly for the comic form in which they were delivered." *Black's Translation of A. W. Schlegel's Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, V. I. p. 224. Preface, xv.—xix.

This is an admirable outline of the plan, but not of the composition of *The Birds*. Gray's excellent argument, published among his valuable M.SS. by Matthias, is nearly as light, pleasing, and humorous as if Aristophanes had himself composed it. The English reader will be better enabled to form a conception of the spirit and humour of the play, from Gray's analysis of a single scene, (Act 1, sc. 4,) than from the most laboured dissertation.

'The birds come flying down, at first one by one, and perch here and there about the scene; and at last the Chorus, in a whole body, come hopping, and fluttering, and twittering in. At the sight of the two men they are in great tumult, and think that their king has betrayed them to the enemy. They determine to tear the two old men to pieces, draw themselves up in battle array, and are giving the word to fall on. Euelpides and Pisthetærus, in all the terrors of death, after upbraiding each the other for bringing him into such distress, and trying in vain to escape, assume courage from mere despair, seize upon the kitchen-furniture which they had brought with them, and armed with pipkins for helmets, and with spits for lances, they present a resolute front to the enemy's phalanx. On the point of battle Epops interposes, pleads hard for his two guests, who are, he says, his wife's relations, and people of wonderful abilities, and well-affected to their commonwealth. His eloquence has its effect: the birds grow less violent, they enter into a truce with the old men, and both sides lay down their arms. Pisthetærus, upon the authority of Æsop's fables, proves to them the great antiquity of their nation; that they were born before the creation of the earth, and before the gods, and once reigned over all countries, as he shows from several testimonies and monuments of different nations; that the cock wears his tiara erect, like the Persian king, and that all mankind start out of their beds at his command; that when the kite makes his first appearance in the spring, every one prostrates himself on the ground before it; that the Egyptians and Phœnicians set about their harvest as soon as the cuckoo is heard; that all kings bear an eagle on their sceptre, and many of the gods carry a bird on their head; that many great men swear by the goose, &c. &c. When he has revived in them the memory of their ancient empire, he laments their present despicable condition, and the affronts put upon them by mankind. They are convinced of what he says, applaud his oration, and desire his advice. He proposes that they shall unite, and build a city in the mid-air, whereby all commerce will effectually be stopped between heaven and earth: the gods will no longer be able to visit at ease their



Semeles and Alcmenas below, nor feast on the fume of sacrifices daily sent up to them, nor men enjoy the benefit of the seasons, nor the fruits of the earth, without permission from those winged deities of the middle region. He shows how mankind will lose nothing by this change of government; that the birds may be worshipped at a far less expense, nothing more than a few berries or a handful of corn; that they will need no sumptuous temples; that by their great knowledge of futurity they will direct their good votaries in all their expeditions, so as they can never fail of success; that the ravens, famed for the length of their lives, may make a present of a century or two to their worshippers; and, besides, the birds will ever be within call, when invoked, and not sit pouting in the clouds, and keeping their state so many miles off. The scheme is highly admired, and the two old men are to be made free of the city, and each of them is to be adorned with a pair of wings at the public charge. Epops invites them to his nest-royal, and entertains them nobly. The nightingale in the meantime joins the Chorus without, and the parabasis begins.' *Preface*, xxiv—xxvi.

We do not mean to pursue a minute verbal criticism; we must, however, object to rendering Greek words, not by translating them into English, but by substituting English analogies in their place; such as rendering the word *ἐκκλησία* by our word Parliament-house. Generically, there may be no difference between an Athenian public assembly, and an English House of Commons. But the word Parliament-house instantaneously carries us to Westminster, and withdraws us from Athens. Now the English translator is bound, as we conceive, to convey us as well as he can, back to the time of Aristophanes; to give us, as nearly as he can, the same portraiture of the times, 'their form and pressure,' as that of the poet, and therefore, to introduce no idea that may dissipate the charm which has wafted us to the ancient world, while we are perusing a play of Aristophanes. The word parliament has such a tendency: it makes the difference of two thousand years in our feelings, and we find ourselves immediately brought back to the lobby of our House of Commons. Again, the chorus Act. I, Scene 6, talks of the *bæres* of the Athenian theatre; an unlucky word, which hurries us with the rapidity of lightning back from Athens, and sets us down among the string of carriages at Covent-garden or Drury-lane.

'Or if in the boxes some spark should discover  
His mistress's husband, the fortunate lover——'

Beck is generally a tasteless and unsure guide. We do not see why his authority should have been followed in preference to the common reading at p. 81, and a part of the sacrificial chaunt of the priest,



' Hail, Sunian hawk ! all hail Pelargick king !'

have been put into the mouth of Pisthetærus. Much of the buffoonery of this entertaining character is lost by it. It is obvious, that the priest is engaged in rites preparatory to the sacrifice, and that Pisthetærus could not know the hymn by heart. Why then should he come in so pat with one of its verses ? In every other part of the scene, it will be seen, that he never speaks from himself, but quibbles on and burlesques what falls from the priest. He merely echoes the latter, lays hold of a catch-word or two for the purpose of the buffoonery, which is natural to him. As when the priest sings,

' And to the goldfinch, goddess Delian,'

this sets him a chattering, and he comes in with,

' Diana, goldfinch now, no more Colænian.'

We shall now extract a few passages both of the dialogue and of the choral odes, as testimonies to the high excellence of the translation. In Act 1, Scene 3, we have a specimen of the playful talent of Aristophanes. Euelpides and Pisthetærus having arrived at the kingdom of the Birds, inquire into their polity, of Epops, king of the Birds. This has been skillfully translated by Mr. Cary ; and the beautiful invocation to the nightingale falls little short of the harmony of the original.

' *Epops.* O come, my mate, break off thy slumbers,  
And round thee fling thy plaintive numbers  
In a moist, melodious hymn,  
Warbled from thy brown throat dim :  
For Itys, our beloved son,  
Thine and mine, now dead and gone,  
Fill the forest with thy moaning ;  
Till through the woodbine boughs the groaning  
Of thy voice to Jove's seat climb,  
And mingle with the starry chime,  
Where golden-tressed Phœbus soon  
Shall answer in as sad a tune,  
From his ivory-clasped lyre,  
That leads in dance the stately quire ;  
And from the blest above shall flow  
A peal accordant to thy woe.'

pp. 20, 21.

The Birds are irritated at the intrusion of the two strangers, and declare war upon them. They have no means of defence but their cooking-utensils which they had brought with them.

' *Chorus.* Ho ! onward ! advance !  
On every side glance

Your pennons, and clip them about :  
 So our vengeance shall strike  
 On each caitiff alike,  
 And they both shall be food for our snout.

‘ Up the shadowy steep,  
 Through the billowy deep,  
 O’er the measureless wilds of the air,  
 They may flee us ; in vain ;  
 We will chase them, and strain  
 Every nerve till we’ve follow’d them there.

‘ No delay ; no delay. Haste to rend and to bite.  
 And quick wheel the captain his wing to the right.

‘ *Euelpides.* ’Tis e’en so. Whither, wretch, can I fly ?

‘ *Pisthetærus.* Then remain.

‘ *Euelpides.* What ? by these to be torn ?

‘ *Pisthetærus.* Canst thou ’scape being ta’en ?

‘ *Euelpides.* I know not the means.

‘ *Pisthetærus.* Let us face them and stand,  
 Prepared for defence with these pots in our hand.

‘ *Euelpides.* What good will our pots do ?

‘ *Pisthetærus.* They’ll scare off the owls.

‘ *Euelpides.* But how shall we deal with those crook-talon’d  
 fowls ?

‘ *Pisthetærus.* Take a spit and have at them.

‘ *Euelpides.* But how for our eyes ?

‘ *Pisthetærus.* A plate or a sauce-boat will amply suffice.

‘ *Euelpides.* What a martial device, thou most dexterous man !  
 Not Nicias himself such inventions could plan.

‘ *Chorus.* Shout, shout, and march on, level bills, linger not ;  
 Strike, pluck, pull and rend ; and first down with that pot.

‘ *Epops.* Stay thy fury, mad beast ; and I charge thee declare,  
 What it is that impels thee to murder and tear  
 Two men, who have given no cause for this strife,  
 But are both of them tribesmen and kin to my wife ?

‘ *Chorus.* On whom may we vengeance more justly repay ?  
 Are the wolves less deserving our mercy than they ?

‘ *Epops.* If their nature be hostile, yet friendly their mind,  
 And they come with some scheme for our welfare design’d—

‘ *Chorus.* For our welfare what scheme should these ever propose,  
 To our fathers of old such inveterate foes ?

‘ *Epops.* The wise their best lessons are taught by a foe ;  
 For to caution alone we security owe ;

And that thou couldst never have learnt from a friend.

’Tis instruction for which on our foes we depend.

The means they suggest for preserving a nation,

Ship-building, manœuvring, and fortification.

Thus to guard all that’s dearest our enemies teach.

‘ *Chorus.* We admit of a parley, convinced by your speech.

‘ *Pisthetærus.* Methinks they’re relenting.

- ' *Chorus.* Fall back on your ranks.  
 ' *Epops.* 'Tis well : for this measure ye owe me your thanks.  
 ' *Chorus.* I dispute not your wisdom ; and ever, as now,  
 To its dictates obedient submissively bow.  
 ' *Pisthetærus.* They're for peace, as I wot.  
     Lower dishes and pot.  
     But with spear, I mean spit,  
     Ported thus, it is fit  
     That we walk to and fro  
     Near the arms we forego ?  
     And keep them in sight.  
     We must not think of flight.  
 ' *Euelpides.* True : but if we should die,  
     Whereabouts shall we lie ?  
 ' *Pisthetærus.* We shall sleep with the brave.  
     Cericus a grave  
     Will afford us publicly ;  
     For, in fight, we will tell  
     Our commander, we fell  
     'Gainst the foe at Orneæ.  
 ' *Chorus.* Retire in order, whence thou cam'st ;  
     And, like a soldier heavy-arm'd,  
     Lay down thy wrath, and let it rest  
     Beside thine anger. We the while  
     Of these will question, who they are,  
     And from what clime,  
     And on what errand come.  
     Ho ! Epops ! on thee I call.'

pp. 34—38.

Being reconciled, Pisthetærus reminds the Birds of their ancient empire, which has been usurped from them by the gods, and proposes that they shall all unite, and build a city in the mid-air, whereby all commerce between heaven and earth will be stopped, and the gods will be deprived of their sacrifices. The song of Pisthetærus, who chaunts the advantages of the Birds in their new city, is beautifully rendered.

- ' *Pisthetærus.* Far better these : they want no roof  
     Of pillar'd temple, massy-proof :  
     For them no gorgeous doors unfold  
     Their valves inlaid with molten gold.  
     In shrubs and bosky hedge they dwell,  
     Their costliest shrine an oaken dell.  
     In sacrifice to their blest power  
     We need but seek some olive bower ;  
     Not traverse hills or pass the main  
     To Delphi's steep or Ammon's fane :  
     Under the arbut's glossy shade,  
     Or arch by wilding berries made,



Oft will we take our wonted stand  
 With wheat or barley; there the hand  
 Raise up to them in simple prayer  
 That we some good of life may share;  
 And they these gifts to us will deal,  
 Scattering but a little meal.

p. 55.

We close our extracts with the Chorus, Act i Sc. 6, into which Aristophanes has brought together some of the most striking images of human fragility, taken from the great poets who preceded him.

*Chorus.* O gentle bird of auburn wing,  
 Gentlest and dearest, that dost sing  
 Consorting still with mine thy lay,  
 Lov'd partner of my wild-wood way,  
 Thou'rt come, thou'rt come; all hail! all hail!  
 I see thee now, sweet nightingale.  
 Low twittering lead thy pipe along;  
 Then sudden in a spring-tide song  
 Burst out the descant bold and free  
 Of anapæstic minstrelsy.

‘ Oh come, ye men, ye brittle things, mere images of clay,  
 Ye flitting leaves, ye shadowy shapes, ye creatures of a day,  
 Poor, wingless, wretched mortals ye, like nothing but a dream;  
 Give heed to us, and list for once to an immortal theme.  
 Immortals we, and live for aye, from age and sorrow free;  
 Our mansion in the viewless air; our thoughts, eternity.  
 Come learn from us, for we can tell ye secrets most sublime,  
 How all things are; and birds exist before the birth of time;  
 How gods and Hell and Chaos rose, and mighty rivers sprang;  
 Come learn aright;—and then from me bid Prodicus go hang.  
 First Chaos was and Night and Hell and Tartarus profound;  
 But Earth was not, nor Sky nor Heaven; so Hell withouten bound  
 Stretch'd forth his bosom dark and deep, by windy tempests blown,  
 When first of all black-winged Night doth lay an egg thereon.  
 In circling hours thence Love was born, an infant heavenly-fair,  
 Glittering his back with golden wings, and fleet as eddying air;  
 With winged Chaos mingling he, amid the gloomy Night,  
 In Tartarus our kind did hatch, and brought us first to light.  
 Till then the immortal race was not, ere Love commingled all;  
 But from the mingling Heav'n was made, and sea and earthy ball;  
 And hence the incorruptible kind of all the blest above;  
 We of those blest the eldest far, undoubted seed of Love.  
 For why? We flit with wings about, and are with lovers still,  
 And many a maiden coy have won to do her wooer's will:  
 One with a quail will oft prevail upon his mistress dear;  
 One sends a moor-hen; one, a goose; another, chanticler.  
 And, from the birds to mortals, all their chief of blessings flow.  
 To them the coming seasons, we, spring, winter, autumn, show.

To bid them sow, the clamouring crane hies o'er the Lybian deep,  
 And tells the mariner to hang his rudder up and sleep;  
 Orestes too, by him forewarn'd, will think of honest labour,  
 And weave a coat, that when he quakes, he may not strip his neighbour.

Another season next the kite announcing, hastes to tell  
 When sheep in spring-time should be clipp'd. Next when 'tis fit to sell

The coat of frize, and buy a frock, that learn ye from the swallow.  
 Your Ammon we and Delphi are, Dodone and Apollo.

So ye to birds do ever turn for oracles divine;  
 Whether ye barter, money make, or in holy wedlock join:  
 Nor aught there is, by augury, but for a bird may pass;  
 A word; a sign; a sound; a sneeze; a servant or an ass.'

pp. 60—66.

---

Art. IV. *Missionary Journal and Memoirs of the Rev. Joseph Wolf, Missionary to the Jews.* Written by Himself. Revised and Edited by John Bayford, Esq. F.S.A. 8vo. pp. 360. Price 7s. London. 1824.

**A** Jew! How difficult is it to rise above the popular associations which connect themselves with this word, and forgetting Duke-street, the Stock Exchange, and the Rothschilds, to regard the Jews in the light in which they claim to be regarded as the descendants of Abraham and the rightful proprietors of Palestine. Of all the nations of antiquity, the Jews and the Arabs are perhaps the only two existing races, whose filiation is sufficiently unequivocal to identify them with their ancestry. The Greeks and the Copts are confessedly a mixed race, and it is by a sort of courtesy that we admit them to be the representatives of the ancient lords of Greece and Egypt. The Romans as a nation have passed away, and the language of modern Rome has far less affinity to the Latin, than the Romaic bears to the Greek of Homer. But, with regard to the Jews and the Arabs, no doubt can exist that they are the actual descendants of the primitive nations. The Arab remains the same that he has almost always been, the half-civilized tenant of the desert, a dweller in tents; they are a nation of herdsmen. The manners and the habits of the Hebrew patriarchs are still extant in the Syrian Bedouins. For that brilliant parenthesis in their history which dates from the appearance of Mahommed, and ends with the division and fall of the Caliphate, has all the appearance of a romance; so sudden was the rise and formation of the Arabian empire, so splendid the golden age of the Caliphate, so total the annihilation

lation of that power which imposed its laws and its religion on the Turk, the Persian, and the Egyptian. The Jew, in like manner, appears to have remained stationary amid the progress and retrograde of surrounding nations in civilization. A few individuals of the Jewish family have, in different countries, risen to affluence and distinction; and these have generally taken the intellectual cast and colour of the portion of society with which they have blended. But the great body of the nation would seem to have retained the traditions, the habits and customs, the physiognomy, the intellectual and moral character of remote ages. Dispersed through all nations, they still preserve the aspect and the feelings of strangers and foreigners; nor has a captivity of seventeen hundred years been able to wean them from the land of their fathers. Let but the decree go forth, that should protect them in returning to their country, as in the days of Cyrus, and Palestine would speedily gather home her sons from every quarter,—men of different languages, different hues, and opposite factions, but united in one common faith and one general expectation relative to their Messiah Ben David, who shall, as their rabbies dream, restore the kingdom to Israel.

How is it that this most ancient and wonderful people, whose existence is a moral phenomenon, should excite less interest in the minds of most persons, than the Hindoos, the Turks, or the American Indians? Can a man deserve the name of a Christian, who feels no regard for this fallen race, whose are the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, the primitive martyrs, and “of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever?” How much has the Apostolic reproof been disregarded, “Boast not against the branches.” The Jews, at the time at which St. Paul vindicated the honours of his nation, were, surely, as proper objects of a Christian’s scorn or detestation as they are now. The consummation of their guilt had already been brought to pass; nor is it to be supposed that the Apostle was animated by a less holy resentment against the murderers of his Lord, than Godfrey of Bouillon, Emmanuel of Portugal, or any other Christian persecutor of this nation of unhappy outcasts. If, then, the very generation who had rejected Christ, and procured his crucifixion, were considered by the Apostle Paul as entitled, not only to his own patriotic regard as a Jew, but to the respect of the Gentiles, on the ground of their distinguished character as the chosen nation of Jehovah,—what can justify the aversion and contempt with which their remote posterity are almost universally regarded?



In the injuries and unutterable cruelties inflicted upon the Jews, during seventeen centuries, by Romans, Christians, and Moslems, we may discern, indeed, the avenging hand of Divine Providence. One is at a loss to account for the universality of this hatred and cruelty, on any other principle than that of a special retributive dispensation, which has, as it were, let loose against them every nation under heaven. The Divine protection has been visibly withdrawn, and has left them utterly defenceless, till they have become "a proverb and a by-word\*;" and yet, their extinction has been constantly, wonderfully prevented. 'Princes and people,' remarks M. Bagnage in his valuable history of the Jews, 'Pagans, Mahomedans, and Christians, disagreeing in so many things, have united in the design of exterminating the Jewish nation, and have not been able to succeed. The Bush of Moses, surrounded with flames, ever burns, and is never consumed.' But still, this awful view of their history affords no extenuation of the malignity of their persecutors. *They* had no commission given them to punish the Jews for the guilt of their forefathers. No one will pretend, that, when the Crusaders burned the Jews in their own synagogues, when the Catholic monarchs of Spain and Portugal attempted their extermination, or when our own Henry III. sold them to his brother Earl Richard as lawful property and plunder,—Christianity authorized, or had any share in dictating such infernal transactions. The authors of those cruelties, there cannot be a doubt, would have been as ready, had they lived in those days, to sell or crucify the Redeemer of the World. '*Fuit quidem hoc, neque ex lege, neque ex religione factum.*' But if the greater injury cannot be justified on the ground of religion, neither can the less. If it was wrong to punish the Jews by torture, pillage, or indiscriminate massacre, it cannot be otherwise than wrong to punish them for being Jews by penal statutes or persecution of any kind. And if not just objects of punishment, neither can they be deserving of the Christian's hatred. At least, we recollect no precept in the New Testament, which runs in these words; Thou shalt hate the Jews; although it would seem as if most Christians had received such a new commandment. The same prejudice which instigated the atrocities practised upon the Jews in the middle ages, is modified by the enlightened spirit of the times, rather than extinguished. The Turk, when he calls an ass *Yehudi*, only expresses a *Christian* contempt—we mean such as Christians, so called, take credit for

---

\* Deut. xxviii. 37.

indulging—towards the Jewish people. And why are they despised? Chiefly for the very vices which result from their political degradation.

It has been observed, and the observation is repeated in all our Cyclopedias, that Judaism, of all religions, is that which is the most rarely abjured. We believe that this is not strictly true. Forced or counterfeit abjurations of Judaism have been notoriously frequent, and wealth has made Christian converts of many European Jews. Nor are we aware that abjurations of the Protestant faith have been less rare than of any other mode of belief. Still, there is truth enough in the observation to entitle it to serious attention. How is the fact to be accounted for? The first Christians were Jews; and wherever the Gospel was carried in primitive times, some converts were made among persons of that nation. There is neither any physical nor moral impossibility, therefore, in the way of such conversions; and to suppose that the whole nation are indiscriminately consigned to judicial blindness, is taking for granted what is countenanced neither by Scripture nor by facts. Now the natural obstacles to the conversion of a Jew to the Christian faith would seem to be wonderfully diminished. The overthrow of the Jewish temple and polity, the establishment and triumph of Christianity, the accumulation of moral evidence by which it is attested, the time that has elapsed since the desolation of Judea, the prevalent conviction that the time for Messiah's appearance must be gone by,—all these circumstances would seem to warrant the expectation that abjurations of Judaism would be much more frequent than even in Apostolic times. The ignorance of the modern Jews, the want of education among them, cannot altogether account for the fact. Not even the general indifference of Christians on the subject, which has succeeded to the fiery and intolerant zeal of bigotry, presents an adequate explanation. There must be some obstacle of longer standing and more extensive operation; and that obstacle is found in the corruption of Christianity. In England, Holland, and some other parts of Europe, it is true, the Jewish inquirer would be brought into contact with a Scriptural creed and a purer worship; and it is simple ignorance, perhaps, and the prejudice of ignorance, together with a Sadducean indifference to all religion, which have hitherto chiefly concurred with the neglect (till of late) of suitable means for their conversion on our part, in preventing the spread of Christianity among them. When abjurations have taken place, the result either of conviction or of policy, as in the case of intermarriages, they have generally taken place silently, the opprobrium attaching to the Jewish name



rendering it undesirable for the individual to preserve any traces of his former faith. The Jews in this country are chiefly descendants of German or Portuguese families. The civil disabilities under which they labour, close to them every avenue of honourable advancement but that of wealth; and thus, by a sort of political necessity, they are led to bend their whole attention to the sordid pursuit of this *summum bonum*, which alone can lift them into civilized society. For what creature so abject, so helpless as a *poor Jew*?

The fact, however, to which we are adverting, looks back through all the centuries during which Christianity has been at a stand with regard to the Jews. A very small portion of this people, moreover, have even now had an opportunity of judging of the religion of the New Testament, purified from those idolatrous corruptions which must needs be, to a devout Jew, an insuperable stumbling-block. Two thirds of the scattered remnant of Israel are computed to be found in the Mahomedan states, in Persia, China, and India. Poland, before the year 1772, was supposed to contain a million of Jews,—above a seventh part of the whole body. The Italian States, Russia, including Moldavia and Wallachia, and the States in which German is spoken, are supposed to contain nearly another million. The remainder, according to the computation of M. Bail, comprising the Jews in France, England, Spain and Portugal, Holland and the Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark, and the United States of America, amount to not quite 200,000; of which one fourth reside in England, and another fourth in France. Thus, not one fortieth part of the Jewish population would appear to be resident in Protestant countries,—that is to say, in countries enlightened by true Christianity. The non-conversion of the Jews, therefore, is not more astonishing than that of the Papists or the Mahomedans in the midst of whom they exist, a sign and a wonder. They have never had the New Testament put into their hands: what could they know of the religion of Christ, except that it was the creed professed by their tyrants and persecutors? In the East, they would see this religion giving way before the sword of Mahomed. In the West, its triumphs were signalled by the fires of the Inquisition. And every where, at Rome, at Madrid, at Vienna, at Moscow, and at Jerusalem, they witnessed the abomination of image or picture worship identified with the rites of Christianity, and beheld the Christians bowing down at the altars of the “Woman-God.” Not all the more than Levitical pomp of the Romish ritual, not all the splendours of an anti-christian hierarchy, nor the stronger inducements of interest, could reconcile the conscience or feelings of a thought-



ful Jew to tenets and practices so repugnant to the very letter of the Decalogue. There is even something to command our respect, certainly much to excite our pity; in the constancy with which, under such circumstances, they have fondly, blindly clung to the tattered shreds and meagre semblance of their ancient faith and polity.

The volume which has suggested these remarks, is the most valuable document we have as yet seen on the subject of the present state and opinions of the Jews. It is replete with the most curious and interesting information. The Writer, Mr. Wolf, is probably known by name to the majority of our readers, as a Jewish convert and missionary. Unhappily, a suspicion and a prejudice attach to the name of a Jewish convert in the minds of the Christian public, created by the equivocal character of some individuals of that persuasion, who, having embraced Christianity, have ultimately proved no ornament to their profession. The blame, however, in such cases, may possibly belong in some measure to those injudicious friends and patrons who have fed the vanity, and overlaid the piety of their *protegés*. It should be remembered too, that a man may be led to renounce a false religion, and to embrace the only true religion, from sincere conviction, and yet remain destitute of real piety. Such a convert is not to be stigmatised as a hypocrite or deceiver, because his subsequent character may disappoint the sanguine hopes of his friends. Many embraced Christianity on its first promulgation, whose hearts were never sanctified by its moral influence. Rammohun Roy is an instance of a sincere and honest convert from an idolatrous system to a mere philosophical creed: he has become a 'rational' believer. There are many Jews who are "almost persuaded," like King Agrippa, to become Christians: they are secretly convinced by the arguments in favour of Christianity. (which seems, indeed, to be the almost inevitable effect of honest inquiry,) but it is a conversion of opinion only. We have no reason, then, to doubt the sincerity of those who have professed to be convinced, and have abjured their former errors. But every convert is not fitted to become a preacher or a missionary, nor does it even follow, that he must be a trust-worthy or a devout man.

Mr. Wolf, however, is a man whose apostolic zeal, united with child-like simplicity of character, is well adapted to disarm and shame prejudice, while his sincerity and piety are beyond the reach of suspicion. Animated by the true spirit of a missionary, he has evinced both courage and patriotism in the choice he has made of the sphere of his labours. He has shewn himself all the better Christian for retaining the affections and

predilections of a Jew. It is not in England that a converted Israelite should be contented to labour as a minister of the Gospel: he might, in that case, expect to have his sincerity called in question. He is no Christian, if he does not feel for the state of his own nation; and if he does feel for his brethren as he ought to do, it will be impossible for him to rest, without making some effort to rouse or to inform some portion of the millions of Jews scattered through distant countries, and more especially will he feel an interest on their behalf who still linger in the land of their fathers. He will not forget Jerusalem. For the mission to which Mr. Wolf has so honourably devoted himself, he is indeed eminently qualified alike by the respectability of his birth, his natural endowments, and his acquired knowledge. He is the son of a Rabbi, and received a strict Jewish education. He was born at Weilersbach, near Bamberg, in Bavaria, in the year 1796. Soon after his birth, his father removed to Halle in Prussia, where he continued to exercise the office of a Rabbi.

‘My father,’ says Mr. Wolf, ‘began to teach me all the Jewish ceremonies, when I was four years old; he told me, that all the Jews were expecting the Messiah every day and every hour; that his advent could not be far off, and at that time we should dine on the great fish called Leviathan. I believed all my father told me, and I considered Christians as worshippers of a cross of wood, and no better than idolaters. I began to read the Hebrew prayer-book when I was six years old, and recited it every day without being able to understand its contents. My father sent me at this time to a public Christian school, to be instructed in German reading; but I had his express command never to be present when the schoolmaster began to speak on a religious subject; and my father, with this view, desired the schoolmaster to allow me to remain at home on those days which were fixed for explaining the Christian doctrine. The schoolmaster did so, and I continued to be an orthodox Jew.’

When Mr. Wolf was about seven years and a half old, his father began to instruct him in the Talmud, designing him for a Rabbi. At this time, he was in the habit of going every evening to buy milk at a barber's who was a Lutheran; and from this worthy man, he first heard any thing tending to disturb his Jewish faith. With the simplicity of a boy, he told the barber of the expectation which had been instilled into his mind, relative to the near approach of the Messiah.

‘The barber and his wife, who were true Christians, heard me,’ he says, ‘with patience and compassion. Then he said to me, “O my dear child, you do not know the true Messiah. Jesus Christ, whom your ancestors did crucify, was the true Messiah; but your ancestors always expected an earthly kingdom, and not a heavenly one; and



therefore they killed him, likewise as they did the prophets; and if you would read without prejudice your own prophets, you would be convinced." I was eight years old. I was confounded when I heard them thus speak. Without being able at that time to read the prophets well, I believed what the barber told me, and said to myself, "It is true that the Jews have killed and persecuted prophets, because my father himself told me so:—perhaps Jesus Christ was killed innocent."

Two days after this conversation, he went to the Lutheran clergyman of the village, and said, 'I will become a Christian.' But he received for his only reply, 'You are yet too young: return to me after a few years.' He kept these circumstances from his father's knowledge, through fear of punishment; but his obvious inquietude, and the questions he put to his father, began to waken fears that he would not always remain a Jew. When he was about eleven, he fell in with some Jewish deists, whose infidel sentiments he so far imbibed, as to begin to disregard the ceremonies of the Jews, and to have doubts respecting Revelation itself. He confesses that he was destitute of any good religious principles, and his moral character began to fall, while an insatiable ambition took possession of his heart. In his thirteenth year, he went to reside with an uncle at Bamberg, where he received lessons in Latin and universal history from a Roman Catholic, and with him he first read the Gospels. Delighted with the perusal, he resolved to embrace the Christian faith, and on his imprudently announcing this intention to his uncle in the presence of other Jews, he brought down upon himself so much displeasure that he found it uncomfortable to remain at Bamberg. He set out for Frankfort, determined to offer himself there for baptism. As yet, he knew no distinction between the Protestant and Romish denominations, and his first application to a Protestant Professor was not very fortunate or encouraging. 'It is not necessary,' this Christian divine told him, 'to become a Christian, because Christ was only a great man, such as our Luther, and you can even be a moral man without being a Christian, which is all that is necessary.' In conformity to this doctrine, he introduced his young novice to some Jews who were 'true Sadducees;' and young Wolf began to wish that the principles of the Deist might be true, but still, could not satisfy himself that they were so. After studying Latin, Greek, and Hebrew three months at Frankfort, he was taken ill, and his reflections while he lay in the hospital, served to deepen his religious impressions. On his recovery, he resolved to return to his native place, once more to see his father; but, on arriving there, found he was no more. Thus left an orphan at fourteen years old, he resolved



to prosecute his studies with the view of eventually becoming a clergyman. It was the project of an ambitious lad, whose ruling passion appears to have been at this time a thirst for literature as the means of honourable distinction. He was evidently extremely uninformed on the subject of religion; and at the time of his baptism into the Romish Church, which took place when he was seventeen years of age, his conversion was little more than a change, but a sincere and well-grounded change, in his speculative opinions. We must not pursue the narrative through all its ingenuous details. After wandering through different parts of Bavaria and the Austrian empire, residing sometimes in convents, at other times subsisting by giving lessons in Hebrew, he was baptized at Prague; from which place, by the advice of the monks of the Benedictine convent, he returned to Vienna, to prosecute the study of philosophy and the oriental dialects. His first step was to find out some good Catholic Christians there, and especially a pious confessor.

‘I heard,’ he says, ‘a good deal of F. S. (Schlegel) who is one of the most learned men and excellent poets in Germany. He was once a Protestant Christian,—only in name, for his religion was formed upon the model of the ancient Greeks and Romans. His lady was the daughter of the famous Jew, called M. Mendelsohn of Berlin, and both became Catholics by persuasion. I introduced myself to them, and was kindly received: his lady is indeed a true Christian, and inherits the talents of her father. She and her husband recommended me to their confessor called Pater Hofbauer. If the Lord our God had not watched over me, I should now have been entirely initiated in the abominable system of Jesuitism; and indeed, I was too much the dupe of it. I did not then discern the sophistry of the system.

‘While Hofbauer was my spiritual guide, one of his fraternity told me that Hofbauer was Vicar-general of a Missionary order.\* I replied with joy, that it was always my intention to become a Missionary, and requested to become incorporated as one of the society; but they said, they had not then a convent, but expected to obtain one in Switzerland. A Bohemian baron, who was a great bigot, began at this time to persecute me because he thought I had embraced some Protestant doctrines; and once, when I spoke of Ganganelli with respect, Hofbauer was very angry, and said to me, “You are full of Lutheran notions.” I began to read the works of F. Schlegel, which he published after his turning to the Roman Church. The Roman Church is there represented as I never saw it before; so that it was neither like the church of Christ, nor like that of Rome, as it now is, nor as it is described by Bossuet and Fenelon: it is the delineation of a religion

---

\* The “Congregatio Sanctissimi Redemptoris,” a revival of the Jesuits’ order under another title.

partly poetical and partly philosophical, in which are introduced the mythology of the old Greeks, and the more modern superstition of the Hindoos. He is a Pagano-Christian. Schlegel considers the crusades as the most noble and holy undertaking of mankind, and as the triumph of Christianity; and he stops with pleasure to dilate on the destruction of those who fell by the sword of nominal Christian crusaders; he defends Charles the Fifth and Philip the Second, and he calls the Virgin Mary the queen of the heavens.'

Mr. Wolf confesses that, at the time, he was unable to refute the sophistry of these opinions, which appear to be precisely those advocated by Chateaubriand in his eloquent but flimsy production entitled, *The Beauties of Christianity*. After remaining a year and a half in Vienna, Mr. Wolf undertook a journey during the vacation into Hungary, where he was staggered by the utter heathenism of the Roman Catholic population.

'I can protest,' he says, 'that the name of Christ and the Bible are unknown to the Catholic people of Hungary, which accounts for the great number of robbers and murderers in that country. The worship of images has taken place of the worship of Christ, though, in some places in Hungary, religious worship is altogether forgotten.'

On his return to Vienna, unable to reconcile what he had witnessed with the spirit of the Catholic religion as it had been represented by the enlightened Count Stolberg, 'the Fenelon of the German Catholics,' he wrote to that nobleman for permission to visit him, and received a cordial invitation.

'I was astonished,' he says, 'when I arrived at Count Stolberg's, and saw that great man. He and his lady, and fifteen children, were examples of true humility and piety. He read with me the New Testament in the original text; he himself and his wife spoke with me of the power of Christ, and of his resurrection, of his humility and love to his elected people: and he said to me very often, I feel great concern and love for you and for your brethren, the children of Abraham. He spoke with horror both of the Inquisition and the Crusades, and considered both as abominable. He considered John Huss as a martyr, and spoke of Luther with great regard. It was his intention, I should remain in his house some years; and I also desired and intended it, because I found myself very happy in the company of this great man. But it was not the will of God that I should remain any longer than three months in the house of this great man. When Napoleon returned from Elba to France, Count Stolberg and his family were in great distress, because he was always an adversary of that tyrant, and wrote continually against him; and being so near France, he was in danger, and determined to go to Holstein to his brother, to put himself and children in security. I left his house with tears, because he was my true friend; and believing that his

system is the true spirit of the Roman church, and accords with the system of Catholicism in all ages, I continued a true follower of the Roman church; and when I stopped, after my departure from Count Stolberg, sometimes with learned men of the Protestant denomination, I defended with great fire the Roman church; and when they said, The Catholics believe the infallibility of the Pope, and command to worship images, I denied, and declared that Count Stolberg had taught me the true spirit of Catholicism, which was nothing else than the true doctrine of the Gospel. They replied, "Stolberg is a good Christian, but has formed for himself his own Catholicism, which is different from that of Rome: go to Rome, and you will be convinced." "

To Rome Mr. Wolf went, having been recommended by the Pope's ambassador at Vienna to the Cardinal Litta, as a proper person to be admitted into the college of the Propaganda. In his way, he spent two weeks at Basle with Madame Krudener and some Protestant Christians. At Vevay, he fell in with other pious Protestants, who tried to dissuade him from going on; but he replied, 'I will go to Rome, and see what my Pope believes.' At Milan, some Catholic professors, whom he characterises as true worshippers of Christ, gave him a similar caution. 'They vend in Rome Christ and the Gospel,' they said, 'but only the Pope is worshipped.' He was resolved, however, to persist in his intention. The first acquaintance which he made on his arrival at Rome, were two 'truly converted Jews, painters from Germany:' they already knew each other by report. Who would have expected to hear of Jewish converts studying the fine arts at Rome? On the 9th of August 1816, he was introduced to Pius VII., who received him with great kindness; and under his auspices, he entered the *Seminario Romano* on the 5th of the succeeding month, being now twenty years of age.

The account of his residence at Rome, and the details of the disputations in which his inquiring spirit and ingenuous character soon involved him, are extremely interesting; but for these, we must refer our readers to Mr. Wolf's narrative. The result was, his dismissal from the Propaganda, and his being sent back to Vienna. It appears that the acquaintance which he formed with Mr. Drummond, General Macauley, Lord Calthorpe, and other English gentlemen connected with the British Bible Society, was one circumstance which gave great umbrage to his patrons, while his boldly denying the infallibility of the Pope, and the dislike he expressed to the scholastic divinity, drew down upon him the persecution of the whole college. From Cardinal Litta, personally, he experienced much forbearance and kindness. Mr. Wolf describes him as



the most learned and respectable of all the cardinals, and he seems to be, though a thorough-paced papist, an amiable man.

Mr. Wolf describes himself as in a most melancholy frame of mind when he arrived at Vienna.

'The recollection,' he says, 'of being sent away from my pious German friends at Rome, without having been able to embrace them before my departure—that I had been banished by Pius VII., whose private piety I respected, and whom I did like very much,—that I had been separated from a visible church, and condemned by its bishop,—the idea that I should now become an object of persecution,—and the experience that many of my German Catholic friends who had accorded with my sentiments against the Pope, now began to fear the Pope's power, and to turn away from me,—all these things stood clear before my mind; as well as the probability that my career was now stopped, and that I should never be able to preach the Gospel to my brethren.'

He wrote to P. Hofbauer, entreating to be sent to his convent at Valsainte in Switzerland, that he might end his days there; and after remaining in suspense for seven months, during which he was treated in a very harsh manner, his request was granted. His spirit appears now to have been greatly subdued, and he was almost brought to a passive acquiescence in all the abuses of the Romish Church. He arrived at Valsainte in December, 1818, being then twenty-three years of age, and immediately assumed the habit of the Ligorian order,—'a black, rough garment to which is attached a long chaplet of the Virgin Mary, shoes without buckles, and a large hat.' In this convent he became still further disgusted with the spirit, the dogmas, and the profligacy of Popery. 'An insatiable covetousness was exhibited here,' he says, 'such as I never saw before.' 'I saw by experience, that external piety might be united with internal iniquity.' After residing here for seven months, he resolved on leaving it for one that should not be so immediately subjected to the Romish See, and which sent out missionaries to the East. The Rector, on his departure, gave him a testimonial certifying his good moral conduct, but not, as is usual, his orthodoxy; for he had shewn an obstinate desire to study the Scriptures, to the neglect of the casuistic divinity and of the wholesome penance of self-flagellation. His intention was to enter a Capuchin convent at Bulle in the canton of Freybourg; but, from circumstances which are not explained, this intention was over-ruled, and he proceeded to Vevay, where he fell in with a Protestant friend, with whom he had become acquainted at Rome. This gentleman recommended him to some friends who, it was thought, might procure for him the patronage of the Emperor of Russia;

and Mr. Wolf proceeded to Lausanne, there to await the result. But, on his arrival there, a different destination awaited him. An English clergyman was then at Lausanne, to whom Mr. Wolf was recommended by his Protestant friends, and by that gentleman's advice, he determined to come to this country. He arrived in London in June 1819, having nearly completed his twenty-fourth year. Here Mr. Wolf's own narrative terminates. His subsequent history is briefly given by the Editor.

\* The English gentleman to whom he had become known at Rome, and from whom he there received the promise of protection, welcomed him on his arrival in England, and afterwards recommended him to the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, as a person likely to prove a valuable missionary for Jerusalem and the East. The Society was satisfied with his appearance and his conversation; and that they might prove and might insure his qualifications, they sent him to reside at Cambridge, under the superintendence and care of the Rev. Charles Simeon and Mr. Professor Lee, who kindly assisted him in the study of the Oriental languages. He remained at Cambridge until the Society opened its Missionary college at Stansted, in Sussex, and then removed thither with the other students.

\* In the spring of the year 1821, some circumstances arose, which made it necessary that Mr. Wolf should proceed to Palestine, without waiting the completion of some previous arrangements, which the Society considered desirable, if he went as their Missionary. And it was therefore arranged, that Mr. Wolf should proceed to Palestine, under the superintendence of the gentleman who had originally recommended him to the Society, and of another friend. He left England accordingly, in the summer of 1821, in a vessel for Gibraltar. He proceeded from thence to Malta, to Alexandria, to Jerusalem, and to different parts of Palestine. He returned again to Malta in the latter end of 1822; and, in the beginning of the year 1823, he went a second time to Palestine, in company with two American Missionaries. The following Journal contains a narrative of his labours during his first visit to Palestine.'

Before we notice the contents of the Journal, we must be allowed to offer a few remarks on the ingenuous and interesting memoir of which we have given a brief analysis. Our readers may have remarked, that the roving disposition which seems an innate characteristic of the Jew, though not peculiar to him, early manifested itself in the subject of this memoir. But with all this natural restlessness, there appears to have been a singular steadiness of purpose. An ardent thirst for knowledge and an ambition to distinguish himself, supplied, in the first instance, the stimulus to the various and persevering efforts which he made to acquire a learned education, and to gain an introduction to the clerical profession. That he should

cease to retain his Jewish creed, was the necessary consequence of his inquiries; but had he not been sincere in his desire after truth, or rather, had not a higher influence than he was at the time conscious of, secretly operated upon his mind, there is every probability that he would have adopted, with the Christian name, the sentiments of the infidel. Had he consulted only his worldly interests, he had every possible inducement to remain within the Romish Church. A fearless honesty in following out his convictions, sometimes bordering on rashness, but the pardonable rashness of an ardent youth, marks the whole of his career. He was repelled from Protestantism, at first, by the heartless deism with which he was led to identify it. He never embraced the dogmas of popery, which revolted alike his reason and his conscience. But in the writings of the more spiritual Catholic authors, and in the instructions of the venerable Count Stolberg, he found a delineation of Christianity which he mistook for the Romish faith. To these he was indebted for his acquaintance with practical Christianity, and by these, together with the perusal of the holy Scriptures, his speculative faith appears to have been kindled into piety. Such a conversion is the more satisfactory, because it so evidently was gradual: he was led on step by step into the knowledge of religion and into an experience of its power. The discipline to which he was subjected, had no doubt a salutary influence on his character; nor could any education have been better adapted to qualify him for the patient, self-denying office of a missionary, on which all along his mind appears to have been bent. That such a man has been rescued from the toils of Jesuitism and the service of the Propaganda, is matter for the highest satisfaction.

The following specimens will evince his united prudence and firmness in conversing with his brethren. At Gibraltar, he was introduced to a Jewish gentleman of considerable property, named Mr. Ben Aruz, with whom the following dialogue took place.

*Ben Aruz.* I am very much obliged for the New Testament; I say always to my friend Cohen that Mr. Wolf is a very sensible man, of great talent, who gains much money, and eats well, and drinks well, and believes in his heart what he likes. All the Jews at Gibraltar are a parcel of fools, who argue with you about the prophets and the law. I was in the world, and know the world very well; I have done myself all that you, Mr. Wolf, do—I went about with bishops arm in arm; I lived many times in convents; moreover I was the *galant homme* of all the ladies; but in the midst of all those things my heart was a Jew—and thus you are, Mr. Wolf,—but you are right!



' *I*. It is sorrowful, indeed, that you know so little of the spirit of the law of Moses and the prophets, so that you think that a man may be a hypocrite, and nevertheless be a Jew. If you, Mr. Ben Aruz, have acted thus in your youth, for a little meat and drink, you have acted wrong, and I tell you that you have not been happy that whole time. And do you think that I should be such a fool to deny my God, my Saviour, for money, for meat and drink? There will be a day of resurrection, a day of universal judgement, and if I should then be in such a state as you suppose, my wretched soul would be in an awful condition. But no, no, I believe rather with all my heart, and all my soul, in Jesus Christ, my Saviour, my Redeemer.

' Mr. Cohen went away, and I was a little while alone with Ben Aruz.

' *Ben Aruz*. Mr. Wolf, I am a man of honour, a man of secrecy, and I assure you with an oath, that I will not betray you; but tell me sincerely, do you believe in Jesus Christ?

' *I*. In Jesus Christ, my Lord, my God—in Jesus Christ, my Lord, my God—in Jesus Christ, my Lord, my God—the heaven above is my witness, and the earth beneath.

' *Ben Aruz*. What use is the Son? We have the Father, and in him we believe!

' *I*. Do you believe in the Father?

' *Ben Aruz*. I believe.

' *I*. And all that he commands?

' *Ben Aruz*. And all that he commands I am obliged to fulfil.

' *I*. The Father commands, "Kiss the Son!"

' *Ben Aruz*. I only tell you this, Mr. Wolf; you will cry out at your death, "I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have done wickedly."

' *I*. Yes, you are right, I shall cry out indeed, "I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have done wickedly;" but at the same time I hope to add, "I hope in thee, Jesus, my Lord, and my Redeemer, and my God!"

On a subsequent interview, this Mr. Ben Aruz renewed the attack. The learned Rabbi Gabay was present.

' *Ben Aruz*. You must confess the name of Christ!

' *I*. Yes, you are right, I must confess the name of Christ, compelled by the grace of the Lord.

' *Ben Aruz*. For all your present welfare depends upon this profession.

' *I*. All my present and future happiness and welfare depend upon it.

' *Ben Aruz*. Courage, Mr. Wolf.

' *I*. Which Jesus Christ, my Lord, will give me.

' *Ben Aruz*. Hold him fast.

' *I*. I will by his grace hold him fast.

' *Ben Aruz*. Or you lose yourself.

' *I*. Or lose myself for ever.

‘ Ben Aruz. You are a man of great talent.

‘ I. I am a poor weak creature, a sinner, who hopes to be saved by Christ Jesus, by his blood!

‘ Gabay. He neither slumbers nor sleeps, the Watchman in Israel! (*He said this in Hebrew.*)

‘ I. He neither slumbers nor sleeps, the Watchman in Israel! (*I, in Hebrew.*)

‘ Gabay. Hear, Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord! (*In Hebrew again.*)

‘ I. Hear, Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord—and Jesus is the Messiah! (*I in Hebrew.*)

‘ Tears stood in the eyes of Gabay, and Ben Aruz became more serious. p. 92.

At Alexandria, Mr. Wolf had several conversations with a Dr. H., who was travelling at the expense of the King of Prussia. This gentleman, who appears to have been a learned Naturalist, but a very bad Christian, expressed his decided opinion that the Missionary Societies would never have success among either Jews, Mahomedans, or Heathens. The Mahomedan, he said, is too much addicted to his ceremonies; the Jew, too much oppressed. Mr. Wolf replied,

‘ We must recur to facts. Have you read Henry Martyn's life, Schwartz, or the conversion of Otaheite? Have you read the accounts of Moritz and Marc\*, with respect to the Jews in Russia? I know myself the Dr. Emanuel Veith, Director of the Hospital at Vienna, a Jew, who for a long time took Voltaire as his guide, and is now preaching the Gospel at his own expense. I know the daughter and the grandsons of Moses Mendelsohn, who are true believers in Jesus. And why should the power of truth not prevail over some, that, by the assistance of God, they may renounce their worldly interests and lusts.’

Dr. M., a German Jew, who has been for many years physician in the Turkish army, was present at this conversation, and observed: That if Mr. Wolf would consider the state of the several denominations of Christians in that country, who murder each other before the altar, while Jews and Mahomedans live together in perfect peace, he would no longer endeavour to join Jews to their communion. Mr. Wolf rejoined: ‘ God forbid that I should try to join Jews, my brethren, to those Gentiles who only call themselves Christians: this never came into my mind. My only desire and wish is, to make them acquainted with their holy writ and with their Saviour, in order that they may become a light to enlighten

---

\* Moritz is preaching to the Jews throughout Russia.

'those Gentiles who call themselves Christians, but are not worthy of the name.' Dr. M. made this remarkable reply. 'If the government in Europe should give them privileges, they all would soon be Christians.'

At Cairo, Mr. Wolf made the following declaration of his faith in the presence of several Rabbies.

'Rabbi, I am the son of a Rabbi, and have received a strict Jewish education. I have studied not only the law and the prophets, but have likewise read something in the Talmud. I perceived, by the grace of the Lord, after many trials, that no man can be happy, except his heart rest in God, and in him alone. I read the law of Moses, and perceived that those Jews are wrong, who despise the word given by God upon the mount Sinai, under thunders and lightnings. I read the prophets, and the psalms of David, and was persuaded that those men spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. After that I arrived at this persuasion, I was obliged to believe that a Messiah was promised to Israel according to that book. I formerly asked my father: he told me that that Messiah was still expected. I looked again some years afterwards in the prophets. I found that that expectation was not a vain one, and that the Messiah shall come, and that he will come, and that he shall not tarry; that the gates of Jerusalem shall be open continually, and shall not be shut day nor night. As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall God rejoice over Jerusalem. Thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah. But I met on the other side with prophecies, which persuaded me that he was already come, and that he will come again. I met with the prophecy of Jacob, that "the sceptre shall not depart until Shiloh comes:" the sceptre is departed, and, of consequence, Shiloh must have come. I met with the prophecy of Daniel; "After threescore and two weeks, Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the Prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary." The city, the holy city Jerusalem is destroyed, (Solomon wept,) the sanctuary destroyed, and the threescore and two weeks past; the Messiah must, therefore, have arrived. I heard, finally, of one person, called Jesus, much hated by the Jews, who did wonders and signs, which are confessed and acknowledged by the rabbies themselves, but they say that he did it by the Shem-hamphorash. I reasoned thus; How should God assist an impostor by means of his most holy name? this is not possible. But yet I did not believe on him, for Moses, that man of God, commanded before his death, saying, "If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams." I therefore examined, first, what that Jesus did speak, whether he said, "Let us go after other gods." No, on the contrary, (I laid before me, and before rabbi I. the New Testament,) I read in this New Testament



the following words: "And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." Seeing that the commandments of Jesus agreed with the doctrines of Moses, and having read his whole Gospel, I soon perceived that he was that prophet whom the Lord has raised up among our brethren like unto Moses; that he was that Messiah who was to be cut off, but not for himself; for he was cut off out of the land of the living for our iniquities. I believed that Jesus was that very seed of the woman, who was to bruise the serpent's head; that he was that Son given unto us, whose name is, Mighty God, Everlasting Father. I believe now that he is the Son of the living God, God over all, blessed for ever. And in this faith I find joy, peace, and rest, which I cannot describe; and I am ready to die for Jesus, my Lord, who hath redeemed me from all evil." pp. 158—160.

In Egypt, Mr. Wolf became acquainted with Mahommed Effendi, an American by birth, whose real name is English. He was born at Boston. At seventeen years of age, he entered a college in America, where he read the writings of Voltaire, and became a complete infidel. But 'thirsting after truth,' he read the Old and New Testaments, by the light, unhappily, of the writings of the German Neologists, and was converted to Socinianism. After this, the perusal of Bishop Marsh's remarks upon the Four Gospels in his edition of Michaelis, led him to doubt their authenticity. He now met with the Koran, and, 'persuaded that it was the Pentateuch 'accommodated to the Gentile,' he embraced Islamism. He has drawn up a defence of Mahommedism, which is in the possession of Mr. Salt. He was at this time an officer in the army of the Pasha, and was only twenty-seven years of age. Mr. Wolf considered him as most sincere in his apostacy, and he certainly betrayed neither the malignity nor the obstinacy of a renegado. He was evidently far from being satisfied or happy; and on one occasion, after confessing that a good Christian is better than a good Mussulman, he added: 'Pray for me, and 'if ever I can persuade myself that Mahomed was a mere 'enthusiast, I will renounce his religion at the risk of my life.' He assured Mr. Wolf, that he prayed in secret five times a day, and he promised to read the New Testament again. Mr. Salt's behaviour towards this unfortunate man, is stated to have had considerable influence in disarming his prejudices against Christianity; and after all his wanderings, there was strong ground to hope that he would be reclaimed at last to the fold of Christ.

On several occasions, Mr. Wolf was involved in disputes

with the Romish priests. The following conversation took place in a Maronite convent in Mount Lebanon, in the presence of Bishop Gandolfi, the Apostolic Vicar. Père Renard, a French priest, opened the conversation.

‘ *Pere Renard*. The endeavour of converting the Jews is a vain thing.

‘ *I*. All the prophets, and St. Paul, contradict your assertion.

‘ *Pere Renard*. They shall be converted to the Catholic church, but not to the Protestant.

‘ *I*. Neither to the *Catholic*, nor to the *Protestant* church, but to Christ; to him they shall look and mourn.

‘ *Pere Renard*. (In a very rough manner.) We must have Peter and his successors for the judge of our faith, if we believe in Christ.

‘ *I*. The Scripture knows nothing of it.

‘ *Pere Renard*. Tu es Petrus, et supra hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam.

‘ *I*. And this he did when he opened his discourse, and three thousand of his hearers received the word of God gladly, and were baptized.

‘ *Pere Renard* now tried, after the method of the Jesuits, to frighten me, saying, Mr. Wolf, I should be ashamed to come forward with that *spirito privato* of the Protestants; we must have a *spiritum communem*; we must not wish to be wiser than so many councils and so many Padres. Do you not know that St. Augustine has said, ‘ *Evangelio non crederem si ecclesia mihi non dixerit*?’

‘ *I*. I come not forward with my *spirito privato*; I tell you only what the Scripture says; the Scripture never tells us that we must have councils and Padres for our guides, but says. First, “Search the Scriptures,” John v. 39. And that the Scripture is sufficient for our salvation, becomes clear by the words of St. Paul, 2 Timothy iii. 15, 16, “The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.” This appears again by St. Paul, Romans xv. 4; and by Psalm cxix. 105, “Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.”

‘ *Pere Renard*. There are many dubious points in Scripture: what can you do when you meet with a passage you cannot understand?

‘ *I*. Pray to God for his Holy Spirit; and I am encouraged to do so, for he saith, Luke xi. 13, “How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him.” And the Scripture is not difficult to be understood; the Holy Spirit itself tells me so; “The word is very nigh unto thee,” and “things revealed belong unto us,” Deut. xxx. 14, xxix. 29.

‘ *Pere Renard*. Look in my face, if you are able.

‘ I looked stedfastly in his face.

‘ *Pere Renard*. Then you think that Luther, qui fuit impudicus, who married a nun, and Henry the Eighth, and you, Mr. Wolf, are alone able to explain Scripture, and all so many Padres and bullæ dogmaticæ Summorum Pontificum have erred?

' I. Neither Luther, who was a holy man, (for marriage is no sin,) nor Henry the Eighth, nor bullæ dogmaticæ Summorum Pontificum, are guides of my faith; the Scripture alone is my guide.

' *Pere Renard*. Is it not an intolerable pride, to think that God will give you alone the Holy Spirit on account of your fervent prayer?

' I. Not on account of the fervency of my prayer, but for the sake of the name and the blood of Christ.

' *Pere Renard*. That cursed spiritus privatus!

' I. I have not told you my private opinion, but what the Scripture tells us, and you are an unbeliever if you do not receive it.

' *Pere Renard*. I shall now tell you something which you will not be able to answer, for my argument will be invincible, and it is as follows; You Protestants say, that we Catholics may be saved; but we Catholics say, that the Protestants cannot be saved; should you, therefore, not rather cast yourself into the arms of a church, where you yourself confess that we may be saved, than remain in a church where the way to salvation is dubious?

' I. I know this argument, for it is of the time of Henry the Fourth, king of France; but I confess that I never was able to persuade myself of the force of it; for, First, the Protestants say, a Catholic may be saved, *distinguo*; a Catholic is saved if he believes in Jesus Christ, *concedo*; but that the Protestants should say that a Catholic is saved without faith in Christ Jesus, *nego*. Secondly, The assertion of the Catholic, that a Protestant is condemned if he remain a Protestant, *distinguo*; without faith in Christ he is condemned, *concedo*; with faith in Christ he is condemned, *nego*; and on this very account I cannot perceive in the least, the force of the argument. But I will ask you a question, When two persons do not agree upon a certain point, what is to be done?

' *Pere Renard*. We must take that point for a basis upon which both agree.

' I. You believe in Scripture, and I believe in Scripture; let us take the Scriptures before us, and decide the question.

' *Pere Renard*. But there is one judge between us, which is the church: Tell me, why will you not become a Roman Catholic?

' I. I cannot believe in the infallibility of the Pope.

' *Pere Renard* (interrupting me). This is not a *dogma* of the church, I myself do not believe it.

' I. Go to Rome, and you will be there considered as *temerarius et impius*, for the divines at Rome say thus, 'Non temere sed pie creditur infallibilitas papæ in cathedra loquentis.'

' *Pere Renard*. The Propaganda has done this, not the Pope.

' I. With the approbation and sanction of the Pope.

' *Pere Renard*. What other doctrine induces you not to believe in the Roman Catholic church?

' I. The doctrine of the worship of the Virgin Mary, of saints, and of images.

' *Pere Renard*. We do not *worship* the Virgin Mary; but for more



convenience we go to his mother, as the English nation go not immediately to their king, but to his ministers.

'I. I must observe, this comparison between an earthly king and the King of kings, is most abominable and impious.

'*Pere Renard*. Omnis comparatio claudicat; but prove it that we worship the Virgin.

'I. 'Salve regina, mater misericordiæ, *vita, dulcedo, et spes nostra*, salve, ad te clamamus exules filii Hevæ, ad te suspiramus, gementes, flentes in hac lacrymarum valle, Eja ergo, *advocata nostra*, **MEDIA-TRIX** nostra, illos tuos misericordes oculos ad nos converte, et Jesum benedictum, fructum ventris tui, nobis post hoc exilium ostende, o clemens, o pia, o dulcis Virgo Maria, tuo filio nos reconcilia, tuo filio nos commenda, tuo filio nos representa.' This prayer is to be found in your officio diurno, which you are obliged to pray every day, and to omit which is considered as peccatum mortale; and the title *mediatrix* is in open contradiction with Scripture, which says, "But one mediator between God and man." ' pp. 230—234.

But no part of Mr. Wolf's journal is perhaps so affectingly interesting as his conversations with the Jews at Jerusalem. He arrived in the holy city, March 9, 1822, and remained there three months, during which time he had almost daily interviews with the rabbies and chief persons of both the Spanish and the Polish Jews, as well as with some Caraites, who are regarded by both classes with a sort of high-church antipathy, and stigmatized as Sadducees, because they reject the Talmud. The chief rabbi of the Polish Jews, Rabbi Mendel Ben Baruch, is generally acknowledged even by the Spanish Jews, to be the greatest divine of the present age. He 'can preach upon every word of the Torah for more than three hours.' He is described as a kind-looking Jew, about fifty years of age, his deportment marked by humility. From the details of the conversations with this master in Israel, he would appear to be the Talmud personified,—a profoundly learned, subtle, doting mystifier, and withal a thorough Pharisee. Mr. Wolf could make nothing of this man: argument he did not understand, and his feelings seem to have been invulnerable. His skill in perverting the Scriptures strikingly corresponds to the representation given of the ancient Pharisees, who made void the law by their tradition. Mr. Wolf was plainly told by Rabbi Mendel and other rabbies, that the Sanhedrin would have put him to death for his faith in Jesus Christ. Several of the Jews, however, discovered considerable candour, and one appeared to have become a sincere convert. The following is Rabbi Mendel's gloss on Isaiah liii. 8, &c. There is apparently some omission or inaccuracy in the manuscript, as the remarks follow in immediate continuation of some similar talmudizing

on Isaiah ix. The verse alluded to runs in our Version, "He was taken from prison and from judgement," &c.

"Israel was deprived of the kingdom and the right of jurisdiction, and by his generation (the gentile world) how much was Israel cast to the ground! He was banished out of the land of the living, (from the land of Canaan,) for the transgression of my people." I interrupted him, and asked, Who was banished for my people?—the people of God? Rabbi Mendel became rather angry: as soon as I observed it, I broke off. Mendel continued: "He made his grave with the wicked, for poor Israel is buried out of the land of promise, and with the rich in his death; the rich is the wicked one." I said to him, that the word *עם* never signifies a kingdom; that the expression "taken out of the land of the living," indicates the death of that man, which agrees with the whole contents of the chapter,— "he has poured out his soul unto death." Also, as soon as we assume the right of altering the text, to say that "the rich" means a wicked one, we cannot rely upon any fact related in Moses.

*Rabbi M.* God forbid! but those expressions which cannot be understood literally, must be taken figuratively. Tell me the meaning of the expression, "with the rich in his death."

*I.* A rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus's disciple, went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus; and then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered.

*Rabbi M.* Apply the whole chapter to Jesus.

The Lord enabled me to do so, and Rabbi Mendel was not able to contradict one single word.

On a subsequent day, Rabbi Mendel argued with Mr. Wolf in the presence of other Jews for several hours. To convince him that the abolition of the ceremonial law was predicted, Mr. Wolf pointed out, Psal. xl. 6—8.; li. 16, 17.; Isa. i. 10—18.; lxvi. 2, 3.; Jer. vii. 21—3.; Hos. vi. 6.; Amos v. 21—24. He asked the Rabbi, Who was the prophet like unto Moses?

*Rabbi M.* The sense is not that the Lord would raise up a prophet who may be equal to Moses, but the Lord will raise up one who is by profession a prophet, as Moses was by profession.

*I.* Then it ought to stand "prophets," not "a prophet."

*Rabbi M.* Jeremiah was meant by it, for the Jews disobeyed the words of Jeremiah, as they disobeyed the orders of Moses.

*I.* Then let us hearken unto Jeremiah, and accept that new covenant which he has predicted. Jer. xxxi. 31—4.

It is most satisfactory to observe the various miserable shifts to which the Rabbies were driven in order to evade the force of their own Scriptures. Isaiah ix. 6. especially perplexed them. One old Jew from Russia, who resides at Jerusalem, waiting for the coming of Messiah, interpreting it of Hezekiah, gave it this turn: "Unto us a just one is given, and the government shall



' be upon his shoulders, and the Wonderful, the Counsellor, ' the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, shall call his name ' the Prince of Peace.' Mr. Wolf shewed in reply, that the word rendered *Son*, is the same that occurs Gen. xvi. 11. in reference to Ishmael, and cannot signify a just one, and that the violent construction put upon the passage is at utter variance with the rules of the language. Accordingly, Rabbi Mendel did not venture upon so dangerous an expedient, but interpreted it, that God should call Hezekiah with six wonderful names, the application of which to that monarch he attempted to justify in a method that set common-sense at defiance. He admitted, however, that ' the man who is here ' *called God by God himself* ' is ' a divine man ; ' though, in shewing how this could possibly have been meant of Hezekiah, he betrayed the utter fallacy of his interpretation. His gloss on the last two names, is equally curious.

' 5. *Father of the everlasting age* ; he was the spiritual Father of Israel, for he protected them, so that they read the Torah in safety, day and night. And he was the *father of the everlasting age*, for there was not such a king after him, nor any such before him, and there shall not be such a one until the arrival of the Messiah. 6. *Prince of Peace* ; for he was a prince by whom peace was established in Israel ; and we find further the words, " Of the increase of his government there shall be no end ; " we meet with a final ם in the midst of the word לְסוֹרֶכָה, and a mystery is hidden in it, viz. God intended to make Hezekiah the Messiah of Israel, and appointed Sennacherib as Gog and Magog ; but justice interfered, and said to God, Why will you make Hezekiah the Messiah of Israel, after that you have appointed David ? and God therefore made a stop to his design, and for this reason לְסוֹרֶכָה is written with a ס final. Rabbi Mendel showed me this *abominable* opinion in Sanhedrin, page 94.' p. 275.

The true application of this passage to the Messiah, after such abortive attempts to make sense of it in any other reference, cannot be doubted. The glosses of Rabbi Mendel and Jehiel Ben Feibish, are worthy of ranking with those of Grotius, Rosenmuller, jun. and Le Clerc on the same passage. All have alike gone astray, but every one in his own way.

Mr. Wolf's Journal contains a great deal of scattered information with regard to the Jews, which is deserving of being preserved and verified. At Gibraltar, there are, according to Rabbi Gabay, 3 or 4000 Jews ; the presidents of the three chief synagogues, however, rated them at not more than 1600. They are all Talmudists, but are excommunicated by the Jews in the East, and are hated by the Jews at Malta, on account of their liberality. The Jews in Portugal, Mr. Wolf was told,



remain faithful to their religion, but the Jews in Spain have entirely forgotten that they are Jews. There is a street at Madrid, entirely inhabited by Catholic Jews. Juan Joseph Heydeck at Madrid, a professor of the university, was a rabbi near Cologne in Germany, and was convinced by reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. At Alexandria, there are a hundred and fifty families; almost all are very poor. According to the same authority, that of Dr. M., the Jewish physician, there are 2000 Jews at Cairo, among whom there are sixty families of Caraites. The President of the Jews at Alexandria, however, assured Mr. Wolf, that there are not more than 300 Jews at Cairo, and 200 at Alexandria. Possibly, he meant families, which would make the accounts pretty nearly agree. Dr. M. calculated that, within the dominions of the Grand Signior, exclusive of the Barbary States, there are 600,000 Jews. The most liberally minded Jews are stated to be those of Salonichi, where they amount to upwards of 30,000. The Moorish Jews are described as a very fine race of people, with open and decided countenances: they are extremely poor, being held in much degradation in Barbary. At Tunis, according to the account given by a Maltese captain, there are more than 20,000. In the Jewish street called Chara, there are more than 10,000 Jews. They have several rabbies, and are well educated, speaking, for the most part, Arabic, Hebrew, Italian, Spanish, and, a few of them, French. Dr. Marpurgo, an Alexandrian Jew, maintained that there are Jews in Abyssinia, who know only the Pentateuch, the Book of Samuel, and the Proverbs of Solomon. 'It seems,' he added, 'that they were sent there on an expedition by King Solomon, when he sent to Ophir for gold, and they did not return.' At Jerusalem, according to Rabbi Mose Secot, a Pharisee and Talmudist of eminence, there are five synagogues and 700 families of Jews. Some are from Salonichi, some from Barbary, others from Poland, and there are a number of Spanish Jews, though it does not appear whether this describes their descent or their persuasion. Between the Spanish and the Polish Jews, there exists the greatest jealousy.

'The Polish Jews residing in Jerusalem, are subdivided into three parties: 1. Into *Polish Jews* who acknowledge the authority of a rabbi who resides in Poland. 2. Into *Pharisees*, who have separated themselves from those of their Polish brethren who acknowledge the rabbi in Poland, and every one of these considers himself as a rabbi, and Rabbi Mendel as their great rabbi. 3. Into *Hasidim*, who pretend to be in continual communion with God, and live a very strict life. The enmity between these parties is so great, that the Pharisee strives to prevent the settlement of the Polish party in Jerusalem;

and the Polish, that of the Pharisees; and they even accuse each other to the Turkish governor.'

Besides these various classes of 'rabbinist Jews,' there are the Caraites, who are called by the former, Sadducees, being regarded as the descendants of the ancient sect mentioned in the Gospels, founded by Sadok. The Caraites themselves protest against it, considering themselves as disciples of Anan, who lived during the Babylonish captivity. From Saadiah, a Caraites resident at Jerusalem, Mr. Wolf obtained the following information.

'I told him, I heard at Acri, that the Caraites were the followers of Sadok. He replied, "God forbid. How can we be Sadducees, whilst we believe in Moses and the Prophets?" I asked him whether they believe in the resurrection of the dead. He said, "Most surely."

'I. How many families of Caraites are here?

'Saadiah. Only three families: we are so much oppressed here, that many of our brethren have gone either to Egypt, or to Kalaa in the Crimea, where our brethren live in peace.

'I. Are you still in correspondence with your brethren in the Crimea, and Egypt?

'Saadiah. Continually, and all of us at Jerusalem have been at Kalaa, and have taken our wives from thence.

'I. How many years since have you been in the Crimea?

'Saadiah. Five years ago I left Kalaa. I lived there more than twenty years; I knew the Emperor Alexander well; O that he may live in prosperity many years: he is our great protector; and Catherine herself did not like the Rabbinist Jews, but she was a friend of the Caraites, for we sent her a letter of great wisdom.

'I. Did you see any English gentlemen at Kalaa?

'Saadiah. There came three; one of them was a great and wise man, and understood Hebrew very well: they brought books with them, which we did not accept, but some have read them.

'I. Will you introduce me to your Rabbi, and shew me your synagogue?

'Saadiah. With great pleasure.

'I. How many Caraites may there be in the whole world?

'Saadiah. I cannot say, but there are some thousands in the Crimea and Polonia; there are some few at Damascus, and a thousand Caraites in Egypt—there are Caraites in India, and in the land of Cush, (Abyssinia,) but with the latter we have never been in correspondence—if you should go to Abyssinia, we will give you letters for them, to hear about their state.' pp. 251, 2.

Mr. Wolf inquired whether they acknowledged as their brethren the Beni Khaibr, mentioned in Niebuhr's Travels. 'God forbid,' was the reply, 'for those Jews never came to Jerusalem. They remained in the desert when Joshua brought



the rest of the people of God into the land of promise; and thus they live in the desert near Mecca, without any knowledge of the law or the prophets, wandering about as robbers and enemies of mankind. They call themselves the Beni Moshe, children of Moses.' On his asking Rabbi Mose Secot about these Arabian Jews, the Rabbi immediately answered, 'They are called the Beni Khaibr.' Mr. Wolf inquired whether they ever came to Jerusalem. 'In the time of Jeremiah the prophet, they came hither,' was the reply; in proof of which he read Jeremiah xxxv. 1—11. From this it appears, that the Beni Khaibr are regarded as descendants of the Rechabites. To this day, Mr. Wolf remarks, they drink no wine, and have neither vineyard, field, nor seed, but dwell, like Arabs, in tents, and are nomade tribes. They believe and observe the law of Moses by tradition, for they are not in possession of the written law. Mose Secot observed, that their name, Khaibr, is to be found in Judges iv. 11. "Now Khaibr (the same as Heber) the Kenite, which was of the children of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses, had severed himself from the Kenites, and pitched his tent in the plain of Zaanaim, which is by Kedesh." It was among the Beni Khaibr, that Sisera met his death, and of whom Deborah sang (Judg. v. 24.), "Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Khaibr the Kenite be." In proof that they are descendants of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, Mose Secot cited Numb. x. 29. The same account is given in the Talmud; and the fact, which is at least highly probable, must be viewed as extremely curious.

Mr. Wolf met with two Samaritans at Jaffa, from whom he obtained some interesting information. They are reduced to a very small remnant. They acknowledge no part of the Scriptures but the books of Moses, and despise alike the Talmud and the Mishna. They have no communication with the Jews. They sacrifice once every year an animal, on the feast of Passover, and have a high priest (as they believe) of the family of Aaron. They expect that Messiah will surely come. Israel Smaria, one of the Samaritans, presented to Mr. Wolf a manuscript history of their sect, written by Hassan Alsuri, who lived five hundred years ago. It is to be hoped, that the contents of this manuscript will see the light. They had heard that some of their brethren reside in Muscovy.

At Deir El Kamr, the capital of the Druse Emir, there are seven families of Jews. Mr. Wolf was told, that Jews had resided there more than 300 years. Two of these Jews had obtained the New Testament, and confessed their persuasion



that Jesus was the Messiah. In Cyprus, there are no Jews, for which is assigned the following reason.

'There were many Jews in Cyprus some hundred years ago; but it came into their mind to establish a new Palestine upon that island. In their fanaticism they murdered many thousands of the Gentile inhabitants, but were finally compelled to lay down their arms and flee from the island.'

Safet and Tiberias contain a great many Jews, but the numbers are not stated. At Bagdad, there are said to be 800 Jewish families. 2,500 Jews, out of 3000, were destroyed in Aleppo by the dreadful earthquake of 1822. Mr. Wolf was at that time in the neighbourhood of Latakia, and owed his safety to sleeping in the open field. His account of the awful catastrophe is very affecting. The synagogues of Aleppo were of high antiquity.

We must now lay down this extremely interesting volume. Mr. Wolf should be recommended to take every opportunity of collecting specific and authentic information respecting the present numbers and circumstances of his nation; this would much enhance the value of his future communications. What may be the eventual result of the spirit of inquiry which has been so extensively excited among the Jews, it is impossible to say. Nothing is more probable, than that a church or sect will be formed of Jewish Christians, who will find in the infidel Jews of the New German Synagogue, and in the Talmudists of the Old Synagogue, their bitter enemies. It will be highly desirable that such converts should, so far as Christianity admits, retain the outward character and customs of Jews. The formation of Jewish schools will be a most important measure: by their means the Hebrew Scriptures may be made to displace the Talmud. The chief difficulty in carrying into effect such measures as might have the most favourable influence on the general body, arises from the uncertain tenure of property and life itself in the Turkish dominions, within which it would be most desirable to fix upon a central station. The Jews still exist in their own country only by sufferance, and the Turkish despotism must be overthrown before Israel can again be gathered. Should the Emperor of Russia ever become master of Syria, we have not the smallest doubt that Palestine would immediately be peopled with Jews. It would be his policy to invite and to protect them, and they can dwell there only under the shadow of some great empire.

It is remarkable that the Jews have uniformly been under the greatest obligations as a nation to foreign conquerors. They

were befriended by Cyrus, by Alexander, in later times by William the Conqueror of England, by Cromwell, by the Empress Catherine, and by Napoleon. They will probably be indebted to yet another conqueror for the opportunity of re-entering their own country with safety. But prior to this, it seems necessary that they should be led to see the folly of expecting a temporal Messiah to conduct them back in triumph. They must abandon the vain-glorious dreams of their Rabbies, and be content quietly and peaceably to re-construct their national polity under favour of some Gentile sovereign. They must for ever give up the expectation of a king, nor expect any other Messiah than him who has already been, and who has promised that he will come a second time. A general conviction of this kind seems, on the one hand, necessary in order to prevent the recurrence of those seditious disorders occasioned in former times by the pretensions of the various impostors who laid claim to the character of Messiah. On the other hand, the restoration of the Jews to their own land under the auspices of some Christian power—not in triumph, headed by another Joshua, but finding their way back as they may, without a head, the sceptre departed, their tribes undistinguishable,—would be likely, more than any other circumstance, to convince them that the time was past for Messiah's appearance, and that they were to look for no further deliverance of a temporal kind. To this conclusion very many of the Jews have already been brought; and such a persuasion might become universal, without their being as a nation converted to the Christian faith. That may be the eventual result of their political restoration, but it will be brought about, no doubt, gradually, and by a moral process. And after all, there will still be room for distinguishing between such a change in the public sentiment, and the personal conversion which can result only from individually embracing the Gospel of Christ.

That their political restoration is in itself desirable, every friend of humanity must, we think, admit. What better claim can the Greek nation shew, to be delivered from the iron yoke of their oppressors, and to regain that political freedom which is the birthright of nations? Their right to Palestine is to the full as valid as that of the Suliots, and Mainotes, and the various Greek clans, to the soil of Greece. The injuries which the Jews have suffered for ages from every nation in Christendom, call loudly for some compensatory efforts on their behalf. An accumulated debt of justice is due to them from society at large, and a debt of gratitude too. Their commercial enterprise, during ages of barbarism, entitles them to be considered as a meritorious and highly useful part of the civilized com-



munity. If not a literary people, they have had their learned men even in modern times; and in this respect, it would be an insult to compare them to the Turks and most of the other Orientals. But a devout Christian must feel that the Jews have far stronger claims than these upon his sympathy and active benevolence. In even its possible bearing on their conversion, their re-instatement in their national privileges will appear to him an event supremely desirable. The truth of Christianity would receive fresh illustration from such a visible fulfilment of its predictions; and, of all missionaries, the Jews might be expected to be the most efficient messengers of the faith they have so long denied, to the Eastern world. By their means it may remain for the fullness of the Gentiles to be gathered into the Church Catholic. As to the agency by which this event may be accomplished, we anticipate nothing miraculous,—nothing which, when it takes place, shall seem out of the ordinary character of this world's affairs. One would wish that the honour of such an achievement were reserved for England; but three things must concur to induce our Government to exert themselves on behalf of the Jews: state policy must recommend the measure, our rulers must have sagacity enough to see this, and they must have it in their power to do all that humanity and policy may dictate. We confess we have little expectation that things will fall out so much for our honour as a nation, as that Syria and Egypt should owe their emancipation from the basest of despotisms, to the efficient protection of Protestant England.

---

Art. V. *A Biographical Portraiture of the late Rev. James Hinton, M.A. Pastor of a Congregational Church in the City of Oxford.* By his Son, John Howard Hinton, M.A. Pastor of a Baptist Church at Reading. 8vo. pp. 384. Price 10s. 6d. Oxford, 1824.

**T**HE real history of the Church of Christ is contained in the lives of its true members, and much that is peculiarly interesting in the religious and domestic history of our country, is to be found only in the annals of the Biographer. The life of a Dissenting minister presents little variety of incident, has little of the interest which attaches to adventures, trials, or achievements in which men of the world can sympathize; but, if the individual has occupied a station of any prominence, his life must supply an interesting section in the local history of the scene of his labours, and exhibit much of the internal state and spirit of the times in which he lived. In this point of view, the present Memoir will be found highly instructive. To

the Protestant Dissenter especially, we may recommend it as a valuable document illustrative of Congregational history. From 1787 to the period of his death in 1823, Mr. Hinton was pastor of the only Dissenting congregation in the city of Oxford. Previously to the formation of the church in 1780, 'pædobaptism had been the prevailing system,' and the anti-pædobaptists who attended, were members of the Baptist church at Abingdon. Mr. Hinton was of the latter denomination, but the church under his pastoral care, continued to consist of both classes. Hitherto, it had been for many years indebted for support to neighbouring stations, and when Mr. Hinton accepted the charge, the whole income which could be offered him, was 60*l.* a year.

'For a dissenting minister,' remarks his Son and Biographer, 'the city of Oxford was a station unusually important and arduous. The persons whose interest was more immediately to be promoted, were few and feeble; just emerging from a state of almost non-existence as a body, while all things conspired to impede and depress them. The commanding influence of the university was, of course, hostile to the progress of dissent; the current of popular feeling also was running forcibly in the same direction: and thus, by the operation of hatred on the one hand, and of fear on the other, the scope of the ministry was contracted, and its influence neutralized. To assist in breaking through the barrier, the people possessed neither wealth, nor influence, nor any earthly facilities. They maintained the struggle against "the powers that be," in perfect weakness; but it was in the name of Him who "hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence." It is important, however, to mark the different aspect of the opposition arising from the two sources which have been mentioned. The Oxford dissenters of that day had to endure no small portion of violent, vulgar, and indiscriminate reproach; but this was wholly from an unbridled populace: the university never thus degraded itself; but, with more effect, used its influence in indirect methods, affecting the avenues of successful employment and advancement in the world. It should be observed, also, that the hostility of this body contemplated, not so much persons who were already dissenters, as those who seemed likely to become such; not so much the existence of dissent, as its propagation. It was allowable that an established system should be maintained, provided it were not extended; and its present supporters might, without complaint, bequeath to the following generation what they had received from the preceding one: but any attempt to enlarge their numbers was severely stigmatized, as indicating a 'spirit of proselytism.' It is thus to be accounted for, that, of the two deacons of the church at the period now under review, both were much re-



spected by the university, and one was actually in the service of a college: to the same cause, also, may probably be referred the stationary character of their administration, and the difficulty (of which the reader will learn something hereafter) of exciting them to measures of vigorous activity. Some principal members of the church, it may be added, were still pædobaptists, to whom it could scarcely be expected that the exhibition of views contrary to their own should be agreeable, especially recollecting at how recent a period theirs had been the prevailing sentiment. There was also in the body a portion of the leaven of antinomianism.' pp. 107, 8.

This, it must be admitted, was no very tempting station, but Mr. Hinton brought to it qualifications singularly adapted to overcome its difficulties and discouragements. Fervour, activity, and perseverance were conspicuous traits in his character. He was especially free from bigotry, his manners were conciliating, his piety spiritual. 'He was not great,' remarks his Son, 'except in goodness; not brilliant, but in usefulness; but in these he has rarely been exceeded.' 'To those who recollect the period of his settlement, and can trace his progress, the influence of his public life appears eminent and remarkable.' The result of his pastoral labours may be given in his own words taken from a paper dated May 31, 1823.

'This day closes the thirty-sixth year of my ministry in Oxford; all years of abundant goodness and mercy. I review them, I trust, with lively emotions of gratitude to my divine Master and Lord, who brought me hither, and has sustained me by his providence and his grace, through so long a series of arduous but delightful duties. I entered this city, in compliance with the invitation of a small but spiritually minded church, June 1, 1787, an obscure individual, known to few, but directed by infinite wisdom. The call of this church was the first I ever received, and I never wished for another. Many others I have since received, but they had no attractions for me: with this church I began, and with it I hope to close, the ministry I have received from the Lord. Divine Redeemer, help me to fulfil it to the end! My first three years I waited and hoped for success: the next seven the prayer of my heart was granted, and the church increased with the increase of God. In the tenth year of my ministry, antinomianism erected its standard, and collected some disciples, who disturbed my peace and threatened my removal: but this danger was mercifully dispelled, as it has been many times since, and I trust it always will be, for the sake of the church of my care, and of the general interests of divine truth in this vicinity. In my twelfth year, the increased congregation demanded, and God provided for them, a larger place of worship. The succeeding eight years were years of prosperity. My health and strength then declined for several years, beneath the weight of my labours: but kind assistance was granted, through the ministry of my brethren Morgan,

Price, Kershaw, and others; and the interest was kept from declining, though the uncertainty of pulpit supplies was sometimes injurious. In 1816, Mr. Thomas was sent to my aid; eloquent, ardent, and popular. God knoweth, my whole soul rejoiced in that popularity. . . . "With my staff I passed over Jordan," and now I have many bands. . . . A church increased from twenty-nine to nearly two hundred members, with several branches from it; the meeting-house twice enlarged; and seven young men (he would have added with peculiar pleasure) sent forth into the ministry. "And still the foundation standeth sure." "Nil desperandum, Christo duce."

The Memoir is divided into three parts; the first relating to Mr. Hinton's personal character, the second, to his ministerial character, the third, to his public character. His example in these various points of view, is highly instructive, and will be particularly so to those who are entering on the duties and trials of the Christian ministry. Without attempting an analysis of the work, we shall give a few detached specimens, with such desultory observations as may present themselves. The following remarks accompany some extracts from his diary; we transcribe them as pointing out an unequivocal indication of genuine spirituality.

'It may be observed, then, that Mr. Hinton's first object was his own spiritual improvement. The religion of the study and of the pulpit was not merely official, but deeply personal. He knew how much danger there is, lest a minister should regard divine truth as a science, and preaching as an art, in the pursuit and practice of which his own piety may be sadly neglected. He endeavoured to guard against this evil by two methods. First, by seeking that his own mind should feed on every passage before he made it the subject of meditation for the pulpit. This was naturally the case with those which were chosen from his devotional reading, as many of his subjects were; and those which otherwise occurred to him, were carefully associated with his sacred retirements. Secondly, by making his discourses, before they were preached, matter of personal application. The reader will have observed that Saturday evening was his regular season for special devotion, applied first to a solemn review of the week, and next to a fervent preparation for the Sabbath; it was thus that he divested himself of whatever professional feelings the composition of his sermon might have produced; and that the truth with which his thoughts were occupied became food for his own mind. By these methods, he eminently succeeded in the very difficult point of being a profitable preacher to himself. He was much concerned whenever his happiness in his public work was dissociated from the pleasures of secret piety; thus, on one occasion, after referring to the success of his ministry, he says, 'My mind is low as to my spiritual concerns. Pray for me; for it would be awful to save those that hear me, and not to be saved myself.' It was a further evidence of his being a devout student, that he was an excellent hearer. Few men were better qua-



lified to know whether a sermon was a good one, but he did not listen with a view to ascertain it : he waited for spiritual instruction and benefit, and heard with satisfaction every serious, affectionate, and faithful minister.

‘ From this prime excellence many advantages arose. For the most part, when he entered more immediately upon study, he knew little of that listlessness and unaptness to exertion, by which probably many an hour is lost, or ineffectually employed. Having felt the savour of his subject, he found pleasure in pursuing it ; and his Saturdays, accordingly, are stated to have been generally very happy days. He mentioned to his sons in the ministry, that his mind was often, for several days, or sometimes weeks, occupied with an interesting passage, and almost oppressed with its grandeur : it was upon such occasions, probably, that in his diary he complained of the poverty of his ideas, while his people were delighted with their fulness. He appears to have been deeply sensible of his need of divine aid in preparation for the pulpit. When happy, he always mentioned that he had been ‘ much assisted in study : ’ and he repeatedly quotes a maxim—‘ Bene orasse est bene studuisse ’—which he earnestly impressed upon his children, and, doubtless, diligently regarded himself.’ pp. 119—21.

As a preacher, Mr. Hinton produced an immediate and powerful impression at Oxford, although three years elapsed before he obtained any evidence of his ministry having been instrumental in the conversion of any individuals. He was, from the first, alive to the importance of catechetical instruction, that primitive and much neglected mode of teaching. His public exercises of this kind were of the most useful and interesting character. He solicited and obtained the attendance of all the children of his congregation, with a select number from the Sunday School, and on these occasions, the Vestry was generally crowded. We should be glad to think that his example, in this respect, might provoke imitation. We are persuaded that the happiest results would attend a general revival of a practice, peculiarly instructive to the instructor, and likely to give him a lasting hold on the minds and affections of the most interesting portion of his charge. From conversing with children, ministers would learn better how to deal with the half-awaked minds of their adult hearers. It would tend to make their style the more simple, and their manner the more affectionate. And nothing would be more adapted to interest the young in the lessons of the pulpit, and to attach them to the pastor as a friend.

Among the difficulties of Mr. Hinton's situation, the constitution of his church, as composed of individuals differing on the subject of infant baptism, is mentioned by his Biographer as exposing him to some embarrassment. Mr. Hinton

himself refers to it in one of his papers in the following terms :  
' I cannot be free in my ministry without giving offence. The  
' congregation is of so mingled a nature, that I find it impos-  
' sible to escape censure, either from baptists or pædobaptists,  
' from Dissenters or friends of the Establishment.' The cen-  
sures of pædobaptists are stated, however, to have been chiefly  
confined to one discontented individual, whose complaint does  
not appear to have been very reasonable. Mr. Hinton's con-  
duct on this occasion, while marked by his characteristic firm-  
ness, was both wise and conciliatory. On the other hand, an  
attempt was made by a zealot of another class, to disturb  
the harmony of the church by expelling the pædobaptists.  
' Finding none to countenance him, he departed, not in a  
' lovely spirit indeed, but one which, however characteristic of  
' the man, is not necessarily so of the cause he had undertaken  
' to plead.'—Rather, not necessarily the spirit of all the men  
who plead that cause, if cause it may be called,—the cause of  
strict communion ! This is true, for the respectable and ami-  
able character of some of the stoutest advocates for this duty  
of disunion, the tolerant abettors of a principle so essenti-  
ally intolerant, has been the chief circumstance which has  
hitherto saved that cause from annihilation. The venerated  
authorities of Booth, and Fuller, and we may add, Joseph  
Kinghorn, have consecrated the dogma in the eyes of hundreds  
of individuals, and given to a few gratuitous positions and  
talismanic phrases the semblance and power of arguments.  
That such men should have held a tenet which assigns to schism  
a place among the articles of faith, must ever remain a moral  
paradox. We can only cease to wonder at it when we recol-  
lect, that Pascal believed in transubstantiation, and Fenelon  
in the authority of the Pope. But while we cheerfully admit  
that there have been men of eminent piety and an excellent  
spirit, among the advocates for what is called strict communion,  
the spirit of the cause has too unequivocally manifested itself  
in the many, to be both an intolerant and a malignant spirit.  
It has especially put on this form towards those Baptist churches  
who have dared to act upon the principle of Christian com-  
munion. The immaculate purity of the strict Baptist discipline  
has even been thought to be vitiated by the tolerance of such  
church-members, as have been guilty of communicating with  
Baptist churches sanctioning mixed communion. But one of  
the worst features of the system, is the petty warfare which it  
wages, in the form of detraction and depreciation, both against  
the living and the dead. The subject of these memoirs was  
not exempted from this contemptible sort of injustice ; and



even good old John Bunyan himself has been praised with some reserve by "them of the Concision" on account of the noble stand which he made in those early times against the bigotry of his brethren.

This pernicious doctrine is, however, daily giving way, except in the Antinomian churches, to whom it may with propriety be abandoned. Let them fence themselves off as much as they can from the Catholic Church of Christ. It is, we think, an indication that the principle is losing ground in some quarters, that its champions are beginning to speak of the inconveniences, rather than of the wickedness of mixed communion, and to hold up such cases as Mr. Hinton's in *terrorem*, to shew the impolicy of the practice. We are glad of this. It betrays the real source of the irritation and zeal displayed by the sectarian party. Once admit that a church is at liberty to legislate according to the dictates of a timid dread of possible inconvenience or a selfish policy,—in other words, once admit expediency as the expounder of the law of Christ,—and particular Baptist churches and national Episcopal churches may claim alike the power and authority to decree both rites and ceremonies and terms of communion.

This is not the place to enter into any lengthened discussion of the subject; but we could not pass over the case of the Oxford congregation, which, so far from affording the least sanction to the narrow policy alluded to, even on the ground of expediency, shews how little reason there is to apprehend any serious or permanent inconvenience from the Christian union so pathetically deprecated. In repelling, however, any real Christian from the Lord's table, some better reason ought to be assigned, than the imaginary or possible inconvenience of admitting him. The excluding party is bound to shew some Scriptural warrant for its proceeding. It is pretended, in the case before us, that the person considered as unbaptized, is, in that character, unentitled to partake of the Lord's Supper. Yet was there ever found a strict-unionist who would have the hardihood to maintain that a conscientious pædobaptist ought not, in his own communion, to celebrate that ordinance? If the argument were valid, he would err in observing the ordinance at all. But the disqualification, by their own shewing, does not relate to the Lord's table, but only to communion with them. The assertion that unbaptized believers in Apostolic days would not have been admitted to the Lord's Supper, might be met by asking whether they would have been admitted to teach in the church;—whether Christian fellowship in all other ordinances would have been cordially conceded, and this, the sign and seal of communion,

have been withheld ;—whether they would have been recommended to observe the Eucharist apart, while with such persons it was deemed unlawful “ even to eat ;”—whether, having publicly confessed Christ before men, and, on the ground of such good confession, been received into other churches, recognised as Christian churches, any persons would have been denied communion with a primitive church ;—finally, whether such person would have been cordially received as a preacher of the Gospel, and honoured as such, yet, stigmatised as an imperfect believer, and punished on that account with exclusion from the Lord’s table, and disqualification for voting in the Church. Unless these questions can be met with an affirmative, the singularly inconsistent conduct of the schismatical Baptists remains without the shadow of support from ancient precedent, unless it be that of the Jewish converts who refused to eat with the uncircumcised. We have joined together participation in the Eucharist and the right of voting in the Church, although we have no proof that, in those days, so much importance was attached to the latter privilege, as to justify their being so associated. But it is well known, that the most cherished prerogative of church-membership in some modern churches, consists of this species of franchise ; and by some persons a readiness has even been expressed to concede to Pædobaptists an admission to the Lord’s table, provided they were not allowed the higher privilege of voting in a Baptist church. Though it would be most unjust to impute such a feeling to all the abettors of the ‘ strict’ principle, we verily believe that the jealousy of a large proportion of the party relates, at bottom, chiefly to this latter point. Unhappily, there is nothing surprising in the case which supposes the love of power to be a stronger and more subtle principle than the love of opinion.

But to return to Mr. Hinton. The censure to which he was exposed from persons of his own persuasion, was excited by a different cause, hostility to evangelical religion.

‘ No man could be more thoroughly evangelical, or more soundly calvinistic ; but false calvinism, or rather antinomianism, was required by the discontents. They could not endure invitations addressed generally to the lost, or exhortations to those who were “ dead in trespasses and sins ;” nor had they any comfort in dwelling on the obligation of the moral law on believers, or in tracing the connexion between duty and privilege in Christian experience. There was, however, one point of a different description—viz. a precise plainness of dress—on which great stress was laid by the dissatisfied persons, and very little by their pastor : and the reader who knows much of human nature will not be surprised that, on this



ground, the hostility was the most violent. But there was nothing at all unusual in the manner in which they treated him. If they arrogantly sat in judgement, and pronounced him to be neither a minister nor a disciple of Christ: if, by malicious insinuations and unmeasured scurrility, they endeavoured to draw away hearers and members, and especially the young and unwary—it is only what such principles have always produced; and when it is otherwise, men may “gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles.” He sometimes met with personal abuse, by which he was much tried; but his public conduct towards his enemies was eminently mild and dignified. It was his rule to preach as though no such men existed, and in all respects to “let them alone,” unless, indeed, they were in distress, when no man was more forward to administer relief. The dissenters were not all members of the church under his care, nor even residents in the city. Some lived at a village several miles distant, and, together with one living in Oxford, were members of the baptist church in ———, from which quarter the most formidable opposition arose. The pastor of that society entered warmly into the consideration of the supposed doctrinal and practical heresies prevailing in his neighbourhood, and sent a person under his immediate countenance, to establish a separate congregation, and to effect the removal of so pernicious an instructor. This was the opposition existing at the close of 1795; it had more appearance of stability than any previous attempt; and was the more discouraging because many of the people, it appears, wished to regard it as a sister church.’

pp. 149, 150.

If strict communion could keep antinomianism out of a church, that would be a stronger argument in favour of the practice, we confess, than has ever yet been urged. We strongly suspect that it has an opposite tendency. Mr. Hinton had at all events no reason to regret, on this occasion, that his church was formed on a different principle. There is a wide difference between strict communion and strict discipline. Mr. Hinton's conduct strikingly illustrated this. In one of his papers, he refers to a tendency sometimes discoverable, to overlook conduct deserving of rebuke, because it might interrupt the tranquillity of the society, or give publicity to what was little known.

‘Nothing,’ says his son, ‘was further from his wish than to do either of these things, but the due exercise of discipline he felt a paramount obligation. To preserve the purity of a church may impede the swelling of its numbers, and sometimes break in upon its comfort; but it is among things most essential to its real and permanent prosperity. Cases sometimes arose which required both wisdom and courage in a high degree; one particularly, in his early life, strikingly discovered the undaunted resolution by which he was characterized. The person alluded to was not a member, but en-

joyed the privileges of christian fellowship as connected (according to his own statement) with a well known church in London. His conduct was found to be inconsistent; it was ascertained, also, that he had been excluded from the community to which he had declared himself to belong: it was clearly necessary to inform him, therefore, that he could no longer be admitted to the Lord's table. But he was rich, and he was passionate; subject indeed to paroxysms of rage, on account of which every one was afraid to interfere with him. The measure was, nevertheless, adopted by the church: but when (according to their usual mode) messengers were to be appointed to communicate the result, the deacons would not go: nor would any one go, for all said it was at the hazard of their lives. 'Then,' replied Mr. Hinton, 'I will go: my life is second to my duty.' But no one would even accompany him; and he went alone. The unhappy man's wrath was exceedingly high. When solemnly warned that no such person as he was could "enter into the kingdom of heaven," he seized a large stick, and threatened his reprover's life: to which he replied, 'Then, sir, I shall meet you next at the bar of judgement; and you will remember that these were the last words I uttered.' The enraged man immediately threw down his weapon, and ran about the room in agony, crying, 'O no, no, no, you shall not charge me with murder!' Mr. Hinton was so deeply impressed with this circumstance, which upon proper occasions he minutely related, that at the end of the year, he records 'the deliverance from —,' among his 'special mercies.' ' pp. 211, 12.

This was conduct truly honourable to his character as a Christian pastor. We can only add, that the volume does much credit, in all respects, to the Biographer.

---

Art. VI. *Eighteenth Report of the Directors of the African Institution*, Read at the Annual General Meeting, held on the 11th day of May, 1824. With an Appendix and a Supplement. 8vo. Price 4s. London. 1824.

**A**LL the Reports issued by this noble Institution are replete with information of the most valuable kind; and if any of our readers have hitherto overlooked these publications, we strongly recommend to them the perusal of the present valuable collection of documents. The existence of this Institution is the best pledge that Africa can have, that happier days await her. But for the exertions of its members, it is not perhaps saying too much to affirm, that her last hope would have been extinguished. Of late, indeed, the British Government has shewn an anxiety to give effect and permanency to the philanthropic plans of the Society. Great Britain and America have at length united in affixing the merited brand and punishment of piracy to the slave-trade; and as the colony of Sierra Leone rises in importance, it will probably be deemed necessary to



take such effective measures for making our flag and arms respected by the barbarous tribes of the interior, as the interests of commerce and the security of our colonies imperiously demand. The lamented death of Sir Charles McCarthy calls loudly, we will not say for revenge, but for vigorous efforts to retrieve the ground that has been lost. It is now seventeen years since the Ashantees first threatened the English fort of Annamaboe. Since then, negotiations, concessions, and conciliatory missions have served only to render this warlike nation of savages more confident in their strength, and more insolent in their demands. Previously to this last aggression, the improvements on the Gold Coast were proceeding at a rapid rate, and the schools at Cape Coast, Annamaboe, and Accra, promised benefits of the highest kind to every class of the population. These pleasing prospects have been suddenly overcast, and a crisis seems to have arrived, which leaves no alternative but either to abandon our African forts, and, by so doing, to leave the Coast open to the undisturbed operations of the slave-traders, the sworn foes of African civilization, or to deprive the Ashantees of the power to give further annoyance. To tamper longer with such an enemy, would seem to be the grossest impolicy. We await with considerable anxiety the determinations of Government on this point.

A very encouraging account is given in this Report, of the progressive improvement of the colony at Sierra Leone. Its trade is on the increase, especially with the interior.

‘It is still more gratifying,’ say the Directors, ‘to witness the rapidly growing intercourse of the Colony with the interior, almost to the banks of the Niger. Caravans of native merchants bring their gold, ivory, and other articles from Fouta Jallon and places beyond it, which they barter in the Colony for British merchandise; and merchants of Sierra Leone have occasionally received from 500*l.* to 1000*l.* worth of gold in a single day in exchange for their goods.’

The following extracts are from one of the Sierra Leone Gazettes, and will serve to correct a very general impression with regard to the peculiar unhealthiness of the Colony.

‘It is with feelings of the deepest sorrow and pity we continue to observe the malevolent attacks made from various quarters upon this infant colony: we shall not, however, attempt to enter into a detail and denial of these mis-statements; but simply content ourselves with the reflection, that our friends are already acquainted with the fallacy of such reports, while the opinion of enemies to such a cause as ours can be of little moment.

‘The principal outcry has been raised against the unhealthiness of

the climate, describing it as being much worse than that of our West-India islands. In answer to this, it is only necessary, for those who may have any doubts, to compare the number of deaths in the squadron under command of Sir George Collier, during an arduous service of three years upon this coast, exposed to every danger from the climate, with the number which occurs in the same period of service, with vessels of the same class and number of men in the West-India islands. The result will be found to be greatly in favour of this colony. From experience also we are enabled to affirm, that the mortality among Europeans who come to settle among us, is not so great in proportion, as will be found in the islands before mentioned.

Since our last statement of the number of caravans of gold merchants, which had visited this town from the interior, several more, possessing gold to a very large amount, have arrived. We have now to notify, that Isaaco, the famous guide of Mungo Park, has reached Port Lugo, on his way to this place from Sego, bringing with him about three thousand dollar's worth of gold. In congratulating the merchants upon the vast accession of trade with the interior, we are bound to remember with gratitude that the opening of this path was effected by the exertions of that meritorious officer, Assistant Staff Surgeon O'Beirne, by his mission to Teembo, which he effected with equal credit to himself, and benefit to the community."

One of our mercantile friends, having read our late remarks upon the vast increase of gold imported into this place, has assured us that we have, in every instance, considerably underrated the amount: he has also stated, what we have since ascertained to be the fact both in the Gambia and here, and which may be considered of considerable importance to the mother country; that is, in the barter for gold, they require nearly the whole in British manufactures, among which may be named, as the most desirable, muslins and prints.

It will be in the remembrance of those who have read the debates in the House of Commons, and various pamphlets published against the abolition of the Slave Trade, that it was frequently urged as an objection to such a measure, that Great Britain would lose a valuable part of her commerce, particularly in her own manufactures. It is needless to state how very, very different has been the result. Throughout the whole line of coast, the trade has improved in a very considerable degree; but in Sierra Leone and the Gambia, it has far outstretched the most sanguine ideas formerly entertained of its probable increase. The amount of exports and imports will best evince the prosperity of those settlements: at the same time it ought to be remembered, that every article of produce shipped to the mother country, is of the most valuable kind, producing in most cases considerable revenue. Could we but eradicate the nest of miscreant slaves in Bissao and the Gallinas, we should then see the whole extent of coast from our settlement of Accra, to that of St. Mary's in the river Gambia, entirely freed from the approach of those vessels, whose visits, like that of an epidemic disease, spread nothing but death and misery to a vast extent around them. Freed from the contaminating influence of these spoilers, and divested of their last remaining hope of the pos-



sibility of a revival of this horrible traffic, the natives would of necessity turn their attention to the collection or production of such articles of legitimate commerce as would procure for them those European luxuries which they cannot now do without. An honourable intercourse, thus established without fear of interruption, would quickly produce such rich fruit as would for ever silence those objections which have been raised against the measures adopted for the relief of suffering Africa. The increase of commerce which would accrue to the mother country thereby, amply repaying her all the money she may have expended in this cause, would satisfy the worldly-minded; while the blood-thirsty wretch who might continue to offer opposition, for the purpose of a direct or indirect participation in the profits arising from such horrible speculations, would be left without a single argument upon which he might found his hateful doctrine.' pp. 199—201.

In the mean time, the restored governments of France, Spain, and Portugal, continue to abuse their power, in contempt of the warmest professions, and the most solemn engagements, by conniving at, or rather protecting the Slave Trade, with all its enormities. Wherever the French flag appears, protection and impunity are granted to the trader. A despatch from the late Sir Robert Mends, dated June 26, 1822, contains the following horrible statements.

“ I am informed, it is almost impossible to credit the extent to which the Slave Trade has been carried on in the Bonny; there having actually sailed from that river, between the months of July and November last year, 126 slave vessels, eighty-six of which were French, and the others Spaniards. Six of them were heavy vessels:—one, a frigate-built ship, mounting 28 twenty-four pounders, long guns, and carronades; 200 men, English, American, and Spaniards;—a corvette of 26 guns, twenty-four pounders, long guns; 150 men;—corvette of 20 guns, thirty-two pounders; 120 men;—corvette of 16 guns, twenty-four pounders, carronades; 96 men;—a brig of 18 thirty-two pounders; 100 men;—and a brig of 16 guns; 60 men, all Portuguese and Spaniards.

“ An immense number have already sailed this year; and I find many more are expected, and have ascertained, from good authority, that they will generally be under the French flag—that is, they sail, with their slaving cargoes on board, from the Havannah, to a port in France, and there clear out, come to this coast under the pretence of purchasing palm oil and ivory, ship their slaves, and return to the coasts of Cuba thus inhumanly laden.

“ By the annexed boarding list, it will appear to their Lordships, that, within a very short period, the ships of war on this coast have boarded forty-five vessels engaged in the Slave trade; viz.

French .....	19
Portuguese .....	19
Spanish .....	6
Swedish.....	1
	—
Total.....	45
	—

Of which, sixteen were captured, having on board 2,481 slaves. These are facts substantiated by unquestionable proofs; and shew, beyond the possibility of doubt or contradiction, the preponderance of France and Portugal in this traffic.”

“ Their Lordships being already acquainted with the desperate attack made by the French and Spanish slave-ships in the river Bonny, in last April, on the boats of this ship and the *Myrmidon*, which ended in the capture of the whole of those ships; I feel it incumbent on me to mention a combination said to be entered into, by the officers and crews of the whole of those vessels, by which they bound themselves to put to death every English officer or man, belonging to the Navy, who might fall into their hands on the coast of Africa. This was in perfect unison with all and every thing which the slave-dealing has engendered. Of a similar nature was the agreement between the Spanish captains and their seamen; the latter binding themselves *blindly to obey every order, of whatever nature it might be*, and, in case of the vessel being taken, not to receive any wages. Such is the depravity to which this Slave Trade debases the mind and the character of the desperate banditti engaged in it. These outlaws and robbers assume any flag, as best suits their purpose at the time; and would equally trample on the Lilly that protects them, as on the Crucifix which they impiously carry in their bosoms.

“ Wherever this baneful trade exists, the civil arts of life recede, commerce disappears, and man becomes doubly ferocious. It is scarcely to be believed, that an attempt was made to blow up a vessel, with upwards of 300 slaves on board, almost all of them in irons, by her crew hanging a lighted match over the magazine, when they abandoned her in their boats, and the *Iphigenia* took possession of her. Were this a solitary instance of the feeling which it elicits, it ought of itself to induce every European Government to take effectual measures for its suppression; but, while succeeding years only bring forward a repetition of similar deeds, varied alone in form and guilt, hypocrisy itself scarcely dares to couple the name of Christian with that of its protectors.”

We make no comment on these statements, but leave them to make their own appeal to our readers.

A very interesting paper will be found in the Appendix, taken from the *Sierra Leone Gazette*, giving an account of the travels of a Tartar merchant over a very considerable portion of the African Continent,—from Tripoli to Cape Coast Castle. He spent five weeks at Timbuctoo, which he makes 64 days



from Coomassie, and 73 from Cape Coast. His testimony appears to favour the opinion of Mr. Bowdich and others, that the waters of the Bahr al Nil or Niger discharge themselves into the Nile. The Quollah, he constantly maintained to be a different river, running in a contrary direction, viz. from E. to W., and entering, as he was informed, the sea to the westward. 'Of the Barneel (Bahr al Nil) he spoke as flowing from Sego to Sansanding, to Jinne, to Timbuctoo, and thence through several countries he had not visited; then, leaving Houssa to the southward, it passed through Turicak, (being the same river he had crossed within one day's journey of Agades, on his route from Mourzook to Kano,) and thence to Habesh, and before it arrived at Masr (Cairo), it formed a junction with the Nile of Egypt.'

---

Art. VII. *The Christian Stewardship.* A Discourse on the Nature and Responsibility of the Sacred Office. Preached before the Homerton College Society, June 22, 1824. By Thomas Morell, President of the Theological Institution at Wymondley. 8vo. pp. 34. Price 1s. 6d. London, 1824.

**W**ERE a competent observer allowed to inspect the internal state of the various theological institutions in this kingdom among Dissenters,—could he ascertain the real value of the literary advantages they impart, and the degree in which sound discipline is maintained in them,—the rank of life from which the students are chiefly taken, and the average standard of their previous attainments,—he would not require to be gifted with miraculous foresight, to predict what will be the character of the Dissenting ministry to which will be confided, in a great measure, the moral direction of the next generation. Should it be found, on such examination, that these institutions are adapted to make good preachers, rather than good scholars, and that previous learning is rarely brought to them,—he would not err in anticipating a decay of solid learning among the body. Should he find any symptoms of relaxed discipline, he would tremble for the cause of piety. Should it appear that the proportion of candidates furnished by the middle classes of society, is on the increase, he would augur well from a circumstance which would indicate that the Christian ministry is rising in public estimation, and that the secular respectability derived from the patronage of the State, is not required to make the station of a Christian pastor honourable. From such circles, he would predict that young men will proceed, of good-breeding and intelligence, who may be expected to

adorn the office which they sustain. Should the contrary prove to be the case, he may console himself by thinking, that an efficient, if not a brilliant or influential ministry may spring up, and that natural talents and fervent zeal may supply the place of cultivation and learning. Yet, the decline of the cause would be but too reasonably inferred from so ominous a presage. Dissenters may go on multiplying in numbers, but, if their principles lose ground among the cultivated classes, the declension of the cause has begun.

The oldest Protestant Dissenting college has not existed quite a century. The pastors of Dissenting churches in the seventeenth century, were, for the most part, University men. That race became extinct in the reign of King William. Their immediate successors were their pupils, and many of them inherited their learning, and did honour to their instructors. Dissenting academies began to be formed early in the last century, and among the names of those who presided over these institutions, some occur of considerable celebrity. The ministers who occupied our pulpits from about 1720 to 1770, were brought up after the regular methods of what may be called this old school. Then arose new-school and no-school divines; learning and orthodoxy quarrelled and parted company: the former turned Socinian and died, the latter became a Methodist. That season of effervescence passed, we have seen Dissenting Academies multiplied in all directions, and among almost all denominations, except the quakers,—with what advantage to the cause of sound learning and piety, the next generation will more fully shew.

The view taken of the sacred office in this plain, affectionate, and judicious discourse, is one with which it is most desirable that every academic should be deeply impressed: “Stewards of the mysteries of God.”

‘It is readily admitted,’ says Mr. Morell, ‘that there is a peculiar and appropriate sense, in which this title might be given to the Apostles and other inspired teachers of Christianity, inasmuch as they were more fully instructed in the will of their Divine Master, and empowered authoritatively to make known that will to others. To them it was given to know, not by the ordinary process of research, but by immediate revelation from God, the mysteries of the kingdom. They were the depositories of revealed truth, by whom it was to be conveyed to mankind. Yet there is also a high and important sense, in which, we apprehend, this title may be given to ordinary pastors and teachers. That we are warranted in this application of the term, will be evident, by referring to a passage in the Epistle of Paul to Titus, in which it is applied to the pastors, or elders, who were to be ordained



in every city: "A bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God." pp. 19, 20.

The honourable nature of the office is vindicated in the following passage.

'But in speaking of the Christian ministry as a stewardship, did the Apostle intend to degrade, or did he not rather magnify his office? For who is the Master of the household? Is he not a Prince, a Sovereign, the Universal Monarch, the King of kings, and Lord of lords? Does he not sway the sceptre of universal dominion? To what can angels and archangels,—to what can the flaming seraphs before the throne aspire, beyond this distinguished honour of being numbered among the servants of the Most High God? Consider also what inestimable treasures are those committed to the trust of the stewards of God:—the Gospel of Christ, with all its amplitude of spiritual blessings; its doctrines, and precepts; its institutions and privileges: its consolations here, and its glorious rewards hereafter;—these, all these, are the treasures which are committed to their trust; with which they are to "occupy till their Lord comes;" and which they may hope to be instrumental in conveying to the ends of the earth. Souls, too—immortal souls, are represented as forming a part, and O, how tremendous a part, of this stewardship! Is it not, then, an honourable and confidential service? Let men of worldly feelings and principles and habits, if they will, pour contempt on that office which is sustained by the Christian minister, as mean and despicable, as servile and dependent;—let them choose, if they will, a calling that opens a wider door to ambition and affluence; if a just estimate be formed of the nature of that office, it will be felt that there is a sacred dignity attaching to it, which monarchs might envy, and beyond which the highest archangel cannot soar.' pp. 23, 4.

Society is incalculably the sufferer, when, from whatever cause, the office is depreciated. How anxious was St. Paul that Timothy should not give occasion to despise his youth!

---

Art. VIII. *Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching*. By Henry Ware, jun. Minister of the Second Church in Boston. 18mo. pp. 94. Boston. (U. S.) 1824.

**T**HIS sensible little treatise, drawn up for the use, in the first instance, of the Students in Harvard University, is well deserving of republication in this country. While it has been the Writer's object, fully and fairly to state the benefits which attend the extemporaneous mode of address, he has taken pains to guard against the dangers and abuses to which it is confessedly liable. By 'extemporaneous preaching,' he does not intend 'unpremeditated preaching;' the latter word, he considers as applicable to the thoughts, the former to the

language only. The attempt to preach without premeditation, he justly deprecates as most unjustifiable. Among the dangers of the practice, the temptation to indolence in preparing for the desk, is admitted to be undoubtedly the most serious and formidable.

'A man finds that, after a little practice, it is an exceedingly easy thing, to fill up his half-hour with declamation which shall pass off very well, and hence he grows negligent in previous meditation, and insensibly degenerates into an empty exhorter, without choice of language, or variety of ideas. We see examples of this wherever we look among those whose preaching is exclusively extempore. In these cases, the evil rises to its magnitude in consequence of their total neglect of the pen. The habit of writing a certain proportion of the time, would, in some measure, counteract this dangerous tendency.

'But it is still insisted,' continues Mr. Ware, 'that man's natural love of ease is not to be trusted; that he will not long continue the drudgery of writing in part; that when he has once gained confidence to speak without study, he will find it so flattering to his indolence, that he will involuntarily give himself up to it, and relinquish the pen altogether; that consequently, there is no security, except in never beginning. To this it may be replied, that they who have not principle and self-government enough to keep them industrious, will not be kept so by being compelled to write sermons. *I think we have abundant proof, that a man may write with as little pains and thinking as he can speak.* It by no means follows, that because it is on paper, it is therefore the result of study. And if it be not, it will be greatly inferior, in point of effect, to an unpremeditated declamation; for, in the latter case, there will probably be at least a temporary excitement of feeling, and consequent vivacity of manner, while, in the former, the indolence of the writer will be made doubly intolerable by his heaviness in reading.

'It cannot be doubted, however, that if any one find his facility of extemporaneous invention likely to prove destructive to his habits of diligent and careful application, it were advisable that he abstained from the practice. It could not be worth while for him to lose his habits of study and thinking, for the sake of an ability to speak, which would avail him but little after his ability to think had been weakened. As for those whose indolence habitually prevails over principle, and who make no preparation for duty, excepting the mechanical one of covering over a certain number of pages,—they have no concern in the ministry, and should be driven to seek some other employment, where their mechanical labour may provide them a livelihood, without injuring their own souls or those of other men.'

The temptation to indolence attendant on the practice of reading sermons, is at least equally strong. It can hardly be expected, that such persons will rigidly confine themselves to the use of their own compositions; and if they do, a practice



which discharges them from the necessity of a moment's pre-meditation before entering the pulpit, the manuscript being once prepared, is but too likely to have an unfavourable influence, by inducing a carelessness in the only effective kind of moral preparation. An indolent man, too, will not study the more, because he writes: he will only read the less. There can be no doubt that the practice of composition is favourable to correctness. And yet, it is well known, that a tolerable degree of correctness of language may be obtained in conversation or public teaching, by persons, strictly speaking, illiterate, and incompetent to write either a sermon or a letter with any thing approaching to the same degree of propriety. It is, therefore, no paradox to affirm, that a preacher's written compositions may be inferior in correctness to his extemporaneous discourses. There is, moreover, a peculiar tact required in writing *for* the pulpit, which few possess. Good writing differs so essentially from the style proper for oratory or familiar address, that there is great danger of falling into an intermediate style possessing the character of neither. We should be disposed to recommend the student to exercise his pen in any species of composition rather than sermons. His object should be to improve himself by writing, not as regards style, which may be better learned from reading the best authors, so much as in the power of close thinking. And sermon-writing is of all kinds, perhaps, the least adapted to foster this habit, being, for the most part, with the shew of method, the most loose and desultory in its character. The chief advantage to be derived from writing one's thoughts, is the obtaining of clear ideas. Furnished with these, little or no preparation of language would be found necessary by the speaker.

'Language,' says Mr. Ware, 'is the last thing he should be anxious about. If he have ideas, and be awake, it will come of itself, unbidden and unsought for. The best language flashes upon the speaker as unexpectedly as upon the hearer. It is the spontaneous gift of the mind, not the extorted boon of a special search. No man who has thoughts, and is interested in them, is at a loss for words—not the most uneducated man; and the words he uses will be according to his education and general habits, not according to the labour of the moment. If he truly feel, and wish to communicate his feelings to those around him, the last thing that will fail will be language. The less he thinks of it, and cares for it, the more copiously and richly will it flow from him; and when he has forgotten every thing but his desire to give vent to his emotions, and to do good, then will the unconscious torrent pour, as it does at no other season. This entire surrender to the spirit which stirs within, is indeed the real secret of all eloquence. "True eloquence," says Milton, "I find to be none but the serious and hearty love of truth; and that whose

mind soever is fully possessed with a fervent desire to know good things, and with the dearest charity to infuse the knowledge of them into others,—when such a man would speak, his words, like so many nimble, airy servitors, trip about him at command, and in well-ordered files, as he would wish, fall aptly into their places. *Rerum enim copia* (says the great Roman Teacher and Example) *verborum copiam gignit.*

It is remarkable, that the prejudice against extemporaneous preaching, which exists in some quarters, has attached itself to no profession but that of the ministry. 'The most fastidious taste,' observes Mr. Ware, 'never carries a written speech to the bar or into the senate.' This does not apply, indeed, to France, and some other foreign countries. But, speaking of the United States, (and the remark equally applies to this country,) he adds:

'The very man who dares not ascend the pulpit without a sermon diligently arranged and filled out to the smallest word, if he had gone into the profession of the law, would, at the same age, and with no greater advantages, address the bench and jury in language altogether unpremeditated. Instances are not wanting, in which the minister who imagined it impossible to put ten sentences together in the pulpit, has found himself able, on changing his profession, to speak fluently for an hour.'

The rules laid down by Mr. Ware, for acquiring the habit of extemporaneous speaking, will be found very serviceable. We can only make room for the following, which we think highly judicious, and at the same time valuable for the recommendation which it conveys, of expository preaching.

'There will be a great advantage in selecting for first efforts expository subjects. To say nothing of the importance and utility of this mode of preaching, which render it desirable that every minister should devote a considerable proportion of his labours to it, it contains great facilities and reliefs for the inexperienced speaker. The close study of a passage of Scripture which is necessary to expounding it, renders it familiar. The exposition is inseparably connected with the text, and necessarily suggested by it. The inferences and practical reflections are in like manner naturally and indissolubly associated with the passage. The train of remark is easily preserved, and embarrassment in a great measure guarded against, by the circumstance that the order of discourse is spread out in the open Bible, upon which the eyes may rest, and by which the thoughts may rally.'

We have no very serious apprehensions that extemporaneous preaching will ever become unpopular among English Dissenters, notwithstanding that we have recently observed in some quarters, a disposition to follow the seductive example of certain celebrated Scotch orators. To read an oration eloquently, is a rare and difficult attainment, which few will be able to master. Mr. Ware urges it as one powerful



recommendation of the extemporary mode of address, that its general adoption would tend to break up 'the constrained, cold, formal, scholastic mode of address, which follows the student from his college duties, and keeps him from immediate contact with the hearts of his fellow men.' We are well persuaded that there are substantial reasons for the preference which he gives to the more popular method.

---

Art. IX. *L'Indépendance de l'Empire du Brésil.* Présentée aux Monarques Européens. Par M. Alphonse de Beauchamp, Historien du Brésil, &c. 8vo. pp. 141. A Paris. 1824.

ONE would have thought that, with the example before them of the United States of America, the re-conquest of Brazil by any forces which Portugal could send against her now independent Colonies, would have appeared too visionary to be attempted. Its virtual independence may be dated from the emigration of the Court of Lisbon. That event shewed, as this writer remarks, that Portugal stood in need of Brazil, but that Brazil had no longer need of Portugal; and it became thenceforward impossible that the union of the two countries should subsist on the same conditions as before. It were sufficient, one would think, to content the sovereign of Portugal, that the throne of Brazil is occupied by a member of the house of Braganza: and no doubt the king himself would have been ready to acquiesce in the elevation of his son to the empire, did not commercial as well as political jealousies prompt the government of the mother country to attempt to recover at once the sovereignty and the monopoly of its ancient possessions. But, says Monsieur Alphonse de Beauchamp, '*Le Brésil est, et restera Independent.*' And he thinks that their holinesses, the allied monarchs, must, on reflection, be satisfied with this. Brazil may and ought to be, he thinks, the monarchical safe-guard of the new hemisphere and of old Europe.

'The accession of Don Pedro to the imperial throne is an advantage to all the European monarchies: the example will not be lost. Let it be recollected, that the United States of America, in establishing their independence, inoculated us with the fever of democracy, unhappily imported into Europe. The contrary will be the case of Brazil, which has preserved the monarchical regime and the hereditary principle. What immense advantages for an ancient race! The example of Brazil will be of great weight beyond the Atlantic, and perhaps, among us. May the fruits of Brazil, grafted on the tree of the European monarchy, be appreciated and enjoyed in both hemispheres!'

The Writer of this tract is, at least in his own estimation, a very great man,—a great historian, a great politician, and

a true prophet. 'Comme historien du Brésil,' he says, 'pouvais-je rester insensible aux grands événemens qui l'agitent & le régénèrent; pouvais-je rester silencieux lorsque les deux Mondes en parlent? Le premier n'ai-je pas annoncé au monde les brillantes destinées de l'empire du Brésil sous le sceptre de l'auguste maison de Bragance?' &c. This is very amusing. But when M. B. affirms that no history of Brazil had appeared before the publication of his work in 1815, and that it was 'a sort of creation,' he shews only that his faithlessness is equal to his ridiculous vanity. The use made in that work of the manuscript documents cited in Southey's History of Brazil, and in the exclusive possession of the English historian, proves that M. de Beauchamp had not only seen the work, which he is so base as to depreciate, but had borrowed from it the very information on which he prides himself. His claim to the title of *historien du Brésil*, is about on a par with that of Goldsmith to be considered as the historian of England. The present Tract contains some interesting information, but the greater part has found its way into the public Journals.

The Empire of Brazil is now calculated to extend over more than two millions of square leagues. Its limits are not precisely defined, but the great river Maranham and the Plata have been considered as its natural boundaries, separating it from the Spanish dominions on the North, and from the territory of Buenos Ayres on the South, while on the West, it is bounded only by Peru and Paraguay. The population, according to the last census, already amounts to upwards of four millions, of whom nearly one half is supposed to be free, viz. 343,000 whites, 426,000 mulattoes, 260,000 Indians, and 160,000 free blacks. Its revenue, which, in 1818, amounted to little more than fourteen millions of francs, had risen, in 1820, to sixty-one millions, and in 1823, to sixty-six millions, and it is rapidly augmenting. Possessed of from a thousand to twelve hundred leagues of coast, with the finest ports in the world, an immense interior navigation, excellent fisheries, and a geographical position peculiarly advantageous, being situated in the narrowest part of the vast channel of the Atlantic, a territory capable of one day affording sustenance to a population of a hundred millions, with abundance of the finest timber for ship-building,—with such immense natural advantages, nothing but a bad government can hinder this rising empire from becoming one of the greatest maritime states in the New World.



## ART. X. SELECT LITERARY INFORMATION.

A New Church of England Psalm Book has recently appeared from the pen of the Rev. Rann Kennedy, A.M. Minister of St. Paul's chapel, Birmingham, the Author of a Work, entitled, *Thoughts on the Music and Words of Psalmody*, as at present in use among members of the Established Church of England. The object of the Editor in this selection has been, to embody the principles laid down in that work. In order to adapt it to the requirements of various classes of purchasers, it has been prepared in four distinct forms, the cheapest of which is for the use of Sunday Schools, and for gratuitous distribution among the poor. Mr. Greatorex, the conductor of His Majesty's Concert of Ancient Music, has composed a collection of Psalm Tunes purposely for Mr. Kennedy's Book of Psalms.

In a few days will be published, Commentaries on the Diseases of the Stomach and Bowels of Children. By Robley Dunglison, M.D. &c. &c.

In the press, and shortly will be published, Vol. I. of the Lectures of Sir Astley Cooper, Bart., on the Principles and Practice of Surgery, as delivered at St. Thomas's and Guy's Hospitals; with additional notes and cases. By Frederick Tyrrell, Esq. Surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital.

The Port-Folio, comprising 200 beautiful and highly finished copper-plate engravings, by Mr. Storer, is now completed in 24 Numbers, or four handsome volumes. This interesting work

is published at the same very reasonable price as *The Antiquarian and Topographical Cabinet*, and being printed in a corresponding manner, forms a pleasing supplement or addition to that popular work.

In the press, and speedily will be published, *Death Bed Scenes*, or the Christian's Companion on entering the Dark Valley. By the Author of the *Evangelical Rambler*.

*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Rev. Edward Williams, D.D. With an Appendix including Remarks on important parts of Theological Science.* By Joseph Gilbert. 1 vol. 8vo.

A new Edition of the late Dr. Fawcett's *Essay on Anger*. To which is prefixed, a brief Sketch of the Memoirs of the Author. 1 vol. 12mo.

*The Modern Traveller*. On the First of October will be published, embellished with two engravings of Costume, Part VII. of this interesting Work, comprising Brazil. The Subscribers are respectfully informed, that, owing to the calamitous fire of the 12th instant, which totally consumed the premises of Mr. Moyes, Printer of the above Work, the Part which was announced to appear on the First of September, is unavoidably deferred till the First of October, part of the Copy, which was in the hands of the Printer, being destroyed. But arrangements have been made, which enable the Publisher confidently to assure the Subscribers, that no further delay will take place.

## ART. XI. LIST OF WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

## BIOGRAPHY.

*The Life and Diary of Lieut. Col. John Blackader, of the Cameronian Regiment, who served under King William and the Duke of Marlborough, in the Wars of Flanders and Germany, and afterwards in Scotland, during the Rebellion of 1715, when he was appointed Deputy Governor of Stirling Castle. Giving an Interesting Account of the various Sieges, Battles, and Services, in which he was engaged, both at home and abroad.* By Andrew Crichton, Author of the *Memoirs of the Rev. John Blackader*. In 1 vol. large 12mo. with an elegant portrait. 7s. 6d.

*The Pastor of Blamont, an Authentic Narrative of the Ministry and Sufferings of the Rev. J. F. Nardin, a French*

*Protestant of the 17th Century.* In 1 vol. 18mo. with a frontispiece. 1s. 6d.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

*Memoirs of the Rose, comprising Botanical, Poetical, and Miscellaneous Recollections of that celebrated Flower. In a Series of Letters to a Lady.* royal 18mo. 4s.

## THEOLOGY.

*Calvinism and Arminianism compared in their Principles and Tendency; or the Doctrines of General Redemption, as held by the Members of the Church of England, and by the early Dutch Arminians, exhibited in their Scriptural Evidence, and in their Connexion with the civil and religious Liberties of Mankind.* By James Nichols. In Two Parts, 8vo. 1l.